

ALEXANDER DUGIN

~ ARTICLES ~

VOLUME 2



BERSERKER

BOOKS



this situation as the end of time. So there's nihilism, negative terms. Maybe that is the reason why they could not get the essence of modernity, because the modernity is purely negative for them, as it is purely positive for modernists. They could as well not understand the modernity, because for them, that's all. That's beauty, that's progress, that's something inevitable, that's nature, that's casual sequence of events that we could not change, something predefined. Modernists don't understand the modernity. And traditionalists understand better than modernists but in negative way, so as well they understand not enough. But with noomahia we could say, that is not only destruction. That is not only nihilism. That is not only chaotic transformation. That is other Logos - third one.

And if we apply to the modernity this concept, we obtain completely new vision and perspective to understand the modernity. And modernity is in the reality ancient. That is not paradox. It is absolutely ancient because it is precedent to the Indo-European Turanian invasion. So we are dealing not with something new. We are dealing in the modernity with something very very old that existed before Indo-European invasion, before Turanian Logos of Apollo. So in that case the modernity is old and Indo-European tradition and Christianity is something new because it came after. And the modernity is return to the pre-Indo-European aspect of civilizations. That is extremely important remark. Because now we are dealing not with something as the end of some natural construction. There is nothing natural in human history. Everything is based on the Logos. So modernity is a moment of noomahia that came the new attack of Titans against the Gods. And this one is a successful attack. So modernity is the victory of the titans, of Cybele, of the serpent over God. Successful attack. So that is the moment of noomahia that existed as potential possibility always. And when the power of light became too weak and too small, the Titans were liberated from the hell and from the chains and they made interruption again in the realm of the order and they have submitted the humanity to their rule. So that is not purely negative description. There is event and we could speak about the Logos of modernity. The modernity has a Logos.

In order to trace the modernity, we could come to the event or the time when modernity started. That was the end of middle ages and Renaissance time was the border time. That was precisely the moment where this noomahia and titanomachy reached the critical stage, in the Renaissance. That is the name for the special battle between Logos of Apollo against the Logos of Cybele where the battle was lost by the Gods. The battle was lost by Indo-European tradition. The battle was lost by this patriarchal existential horizon in favor of this alternative Logos. And we see multiple aspects of that. That is beginning of capitalism, of bourgeois, of national state. That was beginning of secularization of the state and the society, the end of Christianity. And that was reflected in the science, because the modern science is a kind of necessary aspect of modernity. So we are living in the world where our understanding of reality is based on the science. And this science, this modern science (it is called modern science to make a difference from middle ages science) is very special. We could consider its structure. When we begin to read the first texts of authors of modern science, we see very special feature - they criticized Aristotle. Aristotle was a kind of dogmatic scientific concept of middle ages. And

that was scholastic and that was Christian. In Orthodox context, Aristotelian teaching was adapted by John of Damascus to Orthodox Christian doctrine. In western Christianity that was scholastic tradition based on the combination between Platonic and Aristotelian concepts. Aristotle and to a lesser scale Platonism were overthrown in the beginning of the scientific world vision. And we could trace what concretely was attacked, how this titanomachia was developed in the field of the scientific theories. I have dedicated my first thesis to the concept of creation and appearance of modern science.

First of all there was the criticism against the natural places theory of Aristotle or anisotropic version of the space. Anisotropic understanding of the space of the natural places Aristotelian theory was based on the concept of what is movement. According to Aristotle, everything has its own goal, its own entelecheia. The goal is the final reason. That is equivalent with natural space. So everything has its natural space. And the movement of the thing, it is moving toward this natural place. When the thing reaches its natural space, the movement ends. So the movement is because all the things are not in their natural space. They are moving toward them but they prevent each other to get there. And that defines the nature of movement. So everything strives to reach its natural space and because it is a little chaotic under the sphere of moon, (according to Aristotle, there is chaotic movement), so everybody hurt the other. Nobody is in its own space, only God. Only God has reached from the beginning, eternally He is in His natural space. Everything other is out. And that is why everything is living, everything is moving. That is the explanation of the nature of kinetic movement. But that creates the special space with the absolute center for each thing. The absolute center for each thing is its natural place. So everything is striving somewhere, somewhere that is more important, and more natural for things than other place. So you could be at home. The concept of home is very important. Home is the natural place. We are going home. And everything is going home. It is return. It is return to the God but only God is in His own place. That is immovable mover. It is something that moves everything but is not moved by anything. That is the concept. So the space or the cosmos is theocentric. And there is a kind of sacred geography with the special sacred centers, with special points of cult, and all cosmos have the meaning, structure, and reason. So there is a center.

The main attack of Galileo Galilei, Copernicus, and the other was against this concept of the natural place. They affirmed there is no natural place and there is no final reason. There is only casual reason. There is the reason of movement if something makes impact on other thing. So there is casual reason but final reason doesn't exist. Because there is no goal, there is no teleology of the movement. And there is no absolute center. Everything is relative. Everything is moving chaotically as in Aristotelian version, but with no plan, with no goal, and everything is defined by the previous cause. So the cause belongs to the past. And there is no cause of the future. There is no eschatology and no goal. Everything is casual. And there is no center. There is no center in space. Everything is relative. There is no anisotropic space. There is isotropic space. Isotropic space means you will go any way with the same possibility because there is no natural space for things. So everything is absolutely relative. And that was

destruction of Apollonian structure of space and time and destiny and history. Everything is destroyed with that. And that was so called scientific discovery.

Post-modernists show that that was publicity. That was the war of the school, of laboratory. Everything in Galileo Galilei was a kind of trick organized in order to convince the audience that he's great but his personal motivations we could put aside. But what was the meaning of Galileo Galilei and the other founding father of modernity? They destroyed Logos of Apollo represented in Plato and Aristotle by the Logos of Cybele. And the Logos of Cybele was not their discovery. That was return to the third form of Ancient Greek Pre-Socratic philosophy represented by Democritus, and later by Epicurus and Lucretius. They were put aside in the Christian version. Christian world vision was based on Plato and Aristotle, and Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius were put aside and forgotten. They were purged by Logos of Apollo because they belonged to the other vision, the atomistic vision, to the materialistic vision. Already in the ancient time, before Plato, they were anti-Indo-European and they belonged to the context of Logos of Cybele. And they reappeared in the Renaissance. So that is not new. That was something that was denied, that was put off, that was prohibited. That is some prohibited knowledge that reappeared as a dominating one. So postmodernists show that there was nothing convincing in the new ideas and they won not because they were more true. They won because they won. Because something changed in the mind of the Renaissance man that has opened the way to the Logos of Cybele to return with scientific premise. There was atomism.

Atomism belonged to the past. Atomism was rejected by Christian cosmology but it returned with Boyle, with Newton, with Gassendi, with Hobbes, and with Descartes. That is not the chance that Marx had dedicated his doctorate to relations between Epicurus and Democritus. So the most modern philosopher of the 19th century dealt with in his doctorate with very old problem of the matter, of the atomism, and of the evolution. Because evolution, almost Darwinian type, we see Lucretius, in his point that was the idea of the evolution of the species. So the species were confused and little by little they developed into the creatures we know. That was by the Venus, by the Holy Mother that was produced. In Lucretius, there are purely Cybelian topics, purely scientific. So in this Lucretius concept, there are as well black Gods in Democritus. Democritus says that Gods as well have bodies and daemons as well. That was atomic. They live more than the body of human but they will as well die. So dying Gods of Democritus, black Gods or daemons. There was the mixture between scientific and mythological topics but what kind of mythology was that? That was purely materialistic, chthonian, and Cybelian mythology.

At the same time, destruction of verticality, of old order, of old middle ages doctrine and Christian teaching was replaced by new world vision based on Cybelian ideology. Cybelian ideology is strictly materialist and immanentist. There is no heaven. There is no transcendental God. There is substance and everything grows from this substance. And the growth has reason as cause but has no final reason because this growth is something that confuses. It is a kind of growth as such with no reason. That is a

kind of immanent process. And there is no attractor. There is no point to which this growth leads because that is the huge immanent substance that has the goal in itself. So the reason is. The cause is. The final reason is not.

That was reflected in the cosmology of Copernicus. That is not the shift from geocentric to heliocentric doctrine but the reason of Copernican revolution was that there is no center at all. Everything is relative. The earth was not the center, was not natural place of incarnation of God. It is something casual. The earth is something casual. It is some ball that is revolving around some other fireball and so on, in the context of the other balls in the infinite disordered chaotic atomic tradition. What is important is that according to Democritus, atom could be small and invisible or great. That is something like very modern concept of the body, the heavenly body of the particle and so on. So that was reflected in the scientific vision. And what is considered today to be scientific is the same as Cybelian. Cybelian is scientific. What is not Cybelian, what for example insists on the existence of natural place, is not scientific, and is mythological. So there was the change of the Logos but that was not immediately. The Logos of Cybele in scientific world vision appropriated some aspects of Apollonian rationalism, of logic, of Dionysian dialectic. But everything was put under this sign of Cybele. So that was a kind of post-Apollonian culture and that was difference with pre-Apollonian kingdom or civilization of Lepenski Vir, Vinča, or Çatalhöyük. So the civilization of great mother was pre-Apollonian and modernity is the same civilization with the same structure and the same Logos but post-Apollonian. So that was appropriation of methods of logic, of philosophy and put under control of this materialistic, atomistic, immanentistic, substantialist domination.

That was reflected in the politics. That was destruction of empire. That was the essence of modern politics. Because empire, as we have seen, was the normative organization of Christian political space, in Byzantine sense, but as well in the Western Catholic sense. So the concept of modern state and the concept of nation were two concepts directed against empire. That was atomic vision of the state - the state as social and political, with no reason. And the difference between modern state and the empire is there is no final reason, there is no natural space, there is no function or mission of Katehon. The national statehood is directed against Katehonian mission. It is directed against the sacredness of empire and mission of empire. Modern state by definition of Jean Bodin or Thomas Hobbes is created from below as a kind of social contract. And that is Leviathan in Hobbes. Modern state is not reflection of the heavenly paradigm. It is created and has no final reason. It has reason as cause. The reason of this modern state is social contract so it is created by the people, by the individuals, in order to prevent them from the other individuals. So that is completely different concept of politics. It is a revelation that Hobbes has called the Leviathan, the serpent, the modern state. Modern state is a serpent, a dragon that is mechanically organized from below in order to destroy everything that is sacred. The modern state is directed against the empire in its origin.

That appeared precisely in the Renaissance with scientific vision, with this completely new understanding of religion. And the modern state should be secular, with no religious sense. It could have church; Protestant, or Catholic, or Orthodox. But church should be separated and exist outside of politics. So the modern state is titanic. And modern national state is anti-Christian, anti-traditional, anti-European, anti-Apollonian, and anti-Dionysian. It is purely titanic. It is serpent and dragon. And as such it was introduced as Leviathan in the beginning of the modernity.

So what is nation? Nation is as well a concept that appeared precisely in modern meaning in the Renaissance time. Nation is the population living inside of the national state. Nation is absolutely artificial. That is the community of citizens who are those who have created the social contract. So the citizens are participating in social contracts. And citizen can redefine, concluding the other social context, the state. For example, the citizen could conclude that they don't want to live anymore in Belgium and they want to have Flemish state and Bolognian state. They have all the right because Belgium has no reason. It is not reflection of something that is transcendental. It is result of social contract. So the people could create Yugoslavia, could destroy Yugoslavia if they want, because there is no Yugoslavia, there is no France, there is no Belgium, and there is no Germany. So they could easily create one Leviathan or destroy if they think that is better for them. So that is absolutely immanent concept of the politics. And it could be reflected in the vertical structure of state as a tradition of pre-Cybelian Indo-European tradition but it is from the beginning titanic. That is a new kind of hierarchy, a titanic bureaucracy with new type of dominating figure. This type we should regard and describe carefully. Because in modern state, there are not priests. It is clear that secularism has put the priests outside of the government. So they could exist as a cultural institution on the margins for example, as cult or funerals or weddings, something not so important, less and less important. Because marginalization of the church is the process of political modernity and church should be put more and more outside of the political decisions.

In the case of the warrior, warriors were a noble class, aristocracy of the traditional state. They should be marginalized as well. They should be a kind of mercenary by the state. They could not have their arms with them because the arm is a symbol of warrior. They take the arm from the state. And when the state thinks that is enough for them to fight, the state takes the arm back. It is difficult with sword but it is easy with cannon or tank. So it is development of the state weapon (nuclear weapon you could not possess being an aristocrat warrior with private ownership). But if you have no weapon, you're not autonomous warrior. You're just a hired mercenary that serves as a servant with something that is given to you by the state and that is decided bureaucratically. So warrior is not the type that decides. Priests are not the type who decide.

Who decides? There appears a new figure - bourgeois. We are calling that capitalist system. We are calling this bourgeois system. And bourgeois is a normative figure in modernity in political way. And now

we should regard and make a kind of structural analysis of what it is. It is conventional wisdom that bourgeois belongs to the third state (tiers état). That is third function. There are first priests, second warriors, and bourgeois third. It is called tiers état in French (третье сословие in Russian). But here lays a very interesting misunderstanding, because it is represented by the man that lives in the city (bourgeois) and is occupying with the commerce (commercial). That is bourgeois. But this figure was absent from the Turanian society that was nomadic and was very marginal in the traditional sedentary European and Indo-European society, where existed third function, pastoralists and cattlers in one case, and peasants in the other case. But they were not bourgeois. So third function in the classical Indo-European society was peasant or cattler and not the merchant living in the city. So bourgeois is something new. We could not say that that is traditional third function that overcomes first and second. It is not tiers état in the Indo-European sense. There is something else. And bourgeois and merchant living in the city is not a cattler. He has nothing to do with cows, with sheep, with goats. He has nothing to do with laboring earth. He is not peasant. He is turned from that.

But who is that? Who is bourgeois? It is something that is between warrior and peasant. That is very lazy peasant that doesn't want to work on the earth. And it is coward as warrior because he could not affront death. He is in middle - lazy peasant and coward warrior. So it is a slave. In Russian language there is the name 'холоп.' Холоп is slave of the master. So he helps master to live good. It is not servant we could say. It is not free or not free peasant working in its field, maybe paying taxes or giving something else. He doesn't participate in the battle. He is between people and aristocracy, between second and first functions and third. Because the Indo-European cities were founded by warriors in order to be a kind of fortress, in their military strategic relations with the space and with the people, so they were a kind of secondary worker serving these warriors. That was artificial class that has grown with the growth of the commerce in this city. Their appearance as an important class begins precisely in the same moment when begins the Cybelian revenge. They are special form of new sociological type living in the city, busy with the commerce. And it is important that the traditional symbol of Cybele is the town as the crown. Cybele has the crown in the form of town. There is something bourgeois in that crown of town. And there is something perverted in the commerce. So to be busy with commerce, in our traditional Christian and Indo-European logic, we have no pattern, no example, and no place for that. Because it is not war, it is not work, and it is not religious rite. It's something that has no place in the traditional society. But it could exist in the margin of society in order to facilitate some technical aspect but that never was a kind of class or function. It never had its own mythology, its own ethic, its own tradition. And we see in bourgeois something completely unnatural for our tradition, dealing with the commerce and the exchange. They say mild commerce is not war because they're coward. They could not take away as the warrior make, or they could peacefully work for their fields embedded in the traditional society with many cultural traditions concerning any stepped life that is the peasant life. That is the peasant turned from the tradition. That is warrior that could not fight. That is perversion. The bourgeois is the ill type. It is completely sick, sociological sickness, representation of perversion in our traditional way. So majority of bourgeois were peasants but peasants turned from their natural state.

When the peasant that by some reason has lost its possibility, its field, its normal and natural place in the village, it comes to town. But who is the peasant in town? Nobody. He is idiot (ἰδιώτης), idiot in Greek sense, the person with no collective identity. That is something individual. That is atomic. And the atom was the basis of the new materialistic science of the Renaissance. That is new and old figure but one that had no place in the traditional society. That is something that was regarded with pity maybe in traditional society. It is ill peasant (because lazy or too arrogant) and it is coward warrior that didn't want to fight. So that is perversion. It could always be under-class being. Bourgeois is under-class, the group of sick, mad, perverted, anti-normal human being that are idiotical by semantic definition. They have no organic relations with collective identity. Their identity is artificially constructed. They didn't belong to the traditional warrior or agricultural societies. They were devoided of any organic collective qualities. They came to the city and they tried to find their way. It is not the case that bourgeois were from other places or other ethnical group, because they were individuals put in the city, and not belonging to the traditional cooperation and form. And they began to grow in number and they began to define the normative vision of the social normative type. They have dethroned warriors. They have dethroned priests. And they have as well misrepresented third state, because the bourgeois hates peasants, because it exploits him. He doesn't let him sell his things openly because he buys it by itself and they make a speculation. They are speculator. They don't produce anything and they make kind of balls of money in order to manipulate with production. Bourgeois is unproductive. Peasants were productive.

At the same time, bourgeois were partly peasant. Because they came to town from where? Some part from other ethnic groups or some marginal groups, they became bourgeois. But the majority, the growth of the bourgeois state was from peasant. But now we see the real zoological mystery. But who were the European peasants? They were the members of the civilization of Cybele under control of Indo-European horizon. And when they were turned from this controlled structure, the Cybelian origins of the peasantry could be revealed. So that is a kind of liberation of the deepest level of peasant European identity taken from the special Christian and traditional aristocracy, feudal vertical society was liberated. So they were bearers of some very ancient archetypes of ancient collective unconsciousness that was reanimated precisely in the moment of the end of the middle ages.

So we see that modernity and all political theories that were developed in the later phases of modernity dealt with this bourgeois organization. The pure and the most important glorification of bourgeois is liberalism. It is dealing with idiots (idiots in the semantical sense) because the man devoided of any kind of collective identity is idiot (ἰδιώτης) in Greek sense. Liberalism is from the beginning, idiotism. So that is glorification of idiots. The individual is devoided of any collective identity, it's clear. But the Communism is dealing with the same concept. Communists hated as well peasants. They think that everything is developing in the city. And the poor bourgeois are proletariat. The rich bourgeois are bourgeois. But both of them are purely modern (in the conceptual structural sense) industrial figures living in the city, not outside of the city. So Communism was the idea that poor bourgeois should

overcome rich bourgeois and create the society where proletariat should dominate over bourgeois. But who are proletariat? They were ex-peasants coming to the city. And these ex-peasants were devoided, precisely in the Communism conception, from relations with the traditional society. And that was positive in the eyes of Communism. So they were no more peasant and being no more peasant in Communist eyes was the same as having no relations with religion, with the cult, with the culture, with the language, with the traditions, and so on. They were as well, the other form of idiots. There were rich idiots, or more or less easy idiots, bourgeois as basic figure of liberalism. And there were poor idiots as proletariats. But they should be cut from tradition, from traditional state (priests, warriors, or peasant). And they should be put in the artificial commercial structure, commercial spaces of the modern bourgeois city. That was one of the ideas of Communism. And that was good. If we read Marx's manifesto, the majority of it is dedicated to what Marxist Communism is not. Marx and Engels stressed that it is not enough to be anti-bourgeois to be Communist. It is necessary to be post-bourgeois and not pre-bourgeois. And the criticism of the first part of the manifesto of the Communist party was directed against so-called aristocracy, anti-bourgeois, anti-capitalist tradition that were as well anti-bourgeois but pretending to restore some pre-bourgeois, in comparison to feudal or traditional society, Communists should be on the side of bourgeois, of capitalism, but they should not only destroy traditional society. They should help to destroy traditional society but afterwards, the poor citizens of the city (bourgeois is the bourger, someone who lives in the bourg, in the city, in town) poor citizen should overcome rich citizens. So proletarians as bourgeois are absolutely un-traditional. They are two semantically idiotic concepts because there is rich idiot and poor idiots. And poor idiots in the Communist vision should take richness from rich idiots and distribute among the idiots. And where are peasants in this situation? They should be transformed into proletariat. They should be brought to the cities. That is the concept of how to merge the villages with the city. The village was the enemy of Marxism, of Communism. So villages should be destroyed and transformed into city and the peasants should be transformed into workers and workers should be normally industrial workers living in the city, working in the fabric. So that is as well mechanical vision. That was materialistic as well as Liberalism. That is the second political theory.

Third political theory was as well absolutely Cybelian. That is maybe difficult for Serbians with patriotic feeling. But the idea of modern state is artificial creation. Modern state is based on the destruction of empire. Modern state is based on the social contract. And nation is artificial creation of bourgeois. Nation is purely bourgeois concept. It is not organic community, with the state, with warriors, with priests, with peasants. The nation is the concept in center of which is the chauvinistic and egoistic citizen of the city. And the state is created as the city, not as empire. And the peasants as well were considered to be secondary form. They live between one city and the other. They have no proper space. They were considered as citizen. But the term citizen; city is town. Peasant is not citizen. He is villager. In the normative concept of political nationalism, peasants were included. We should speak of citizens and villagers for example. But we are speaking only about citizens. Because we consider peasants to be the citizens of the second sort, so they were politically sub-human in some way in nationalist, communist, and as well liberal concepts. So that was the split in the third function in the beginning of modernity. The split between traditional Indo-European peasantry and this ex-peasantry of ex-peasants coming to town

and becoming bourgeois or proletarian or nationalist. That is why all three political theories, Communism, Liberalism, and Nationalism are absolutely Cybelian. Because modern nationalism is modern, is based on the bourgeois concept. That is artificial unity of the citizens that accentuates not only the freedom of commerce, but most the defense of their own commercial interests by a nation, bureaucracy, or state.

Now we could apply that to geosophy of Europe. Where did modernity start? Modernity started partly in Italy, partly in the northern part of Europe, but the most clear and most bright examples of modernity was Great Britain that began creation of this bourgeois version. That was not revolutionary bourgeois but evolutionary bourgeois history. They tried to introduce more and more bourgeois elements in the government. So Hobbes was one of the English political theorists. But with Cromwell and with Protestant revolution, that was bourgeois revolution. And the killing of the tsar, of the monarch was a kind of symbolic action of dethronement of the traditional Indo-European Logos. Protestantism was as well as we have seen, a kind of titanism inside of Christianity. And all these elements, the development of bourgeois, the killing of monarch, and Protestantism, that was England that was in the center. And the fight of Englishman against Celt-Catholic was inner drama. Because the modernity was on the side of Anglo-Protestants and tradition in their case, in this bi-polar case of English culture, tradition and continuity was on the side of the Celt. That is why the Celts were in that sense, the last defenders of more or less traditional society, in front of purely modernist Cybelian English society.

It is very interesting that there was traditional concept of four Empires in Christian culture. The first empire was Assyrian. The second empire was Achaemenid. The third empire was Greek. And the fourth empire was Roman. That was put into context with prophet Daniel's vision of the giant with the gold head, silver breast, bronze thighs, and iron feet. Iron feet represented Roman Empire, most radical but traditional empire. This tradition had some ties with Katehon. That was transition of Katehon. The Roman Empire was considered to be the last one, where Christ was born. So we have normal concept of four empires. And fourth empire was Roman. Roman and Byzantine were the same, including all the continuation with third Rome and so on with Russia and Bulgarian kingdoms and so on. And the idea was that in the English British revolution, there was the concept of the fifth empire. Fifth empire was called fifth monarchism. That was the tendency that that should be the other empire, beyond Roman one (that was considered beyond the Rome as Catholic). That was a kind of modern, secular, Protestant empire and that was called fifth monarchism. There were two versions of it. In Dutch, in Holland there was Jewish version of it that the fifth empire should be Jewish one. That was among the Jews of the circle of the philosopher Spinoza. And that was Anglo-Saxon concept of fifth monarchism. And they were linked with the same circles of English Protestants living in Holland and coming back to England to give the status of fifth monarch to Cromwell.

But in the story of this giant that is a symbol of this fourth Empire, there is concept that in the iron feet of the giant, there is sand, we could say. And this sand is the fifth element in giant. And thanks to this sand, the giant will fall. So there is a kind of symbol of anti-Christian, post-Christian, post-traditional element, fifth element of sand that makes all this empire unstable. So the fifth empire is precisely the end of empire, the destruction of empire, the destruction of traditional order. It has to do with sand, the fifth element in the vision of Daniel. That is the concept of fifth element or fifth monarchy that was British Empire. British empire was anti-empire that was based on bourgeois concept of nationalism and liberalism (socialism was absent). That was the first and the third political theories represented in this British Empire. So the British Empire was the first modern empire that was anti-traditional empire and that was one of the main sources, philosophical as well with the philosophy of common sense. Common sense philosophy is absolutization of the little individual with idiotic scale of thought, with no great revelations, absolutized mediocrity represented by Reid and by Ferguson. And that was the basis of North American society because these Scottish philosophers of common sense were considered to be philosophical fathers of North American society. That was glorification of idiotic mind with very narrow interests, with pragmatism, with little concern as development of Protestant titanism and positivism. I'm calling that positive subject. That is second man in the three man theory of Tauler (German mystic). That was evolutionary bourgeois concept.

But at the same time in France, there was preparation of revolutionary bourgeois concept with its culmination in the French Revolution, with the concept of purely anti-Christian motivation, with scarlet woman as the symbol of the freedom, with the killing of monarch. That was as well the other revolutionary form, with socialism already, with the concept of preparing socialism and social democracy, the idea of absolute immanence, openly anti-Christian not in the Protestant way but purely atheistic and materialistic. Enlightenment theory was a kind of culmination of all of this modernity. Modernity started with that, with the revenge of Cybele. And all the history of modernity was a kind of purification of this noological pattern. The civilization of Cybele became more and more and more Cybelian. All traces of the previous Indo-European society were purged, were cleansed. That was a kind of creation from more and more perfect Logos of Cybele. For example, what was revolutionary 300 years ago, after that was considered conservative. So new and new stages. But that was construction of very ancient type of civilization.

And when we are dealing with modern feminism, that is the finalization of the process. It is not the beginning of something. So now Cybele appears as it is. This march of Madonna in New York against Trump, with hundreds of thousands of women with rose cat disguise in order to kill the Trump is a kind of call for castration of the male figure. They try to sacrifice Trump as a symbol of the patriarchy. He is macho, male, a symbol of the previous stage of civilization. So it is modern feminism and politics and minds in education and social norms, and juridical acceptance of homosexuality that was the part of the Cybelian procession. Homosexuality was a kind of part of typically Cybelian cult. They participate in the procession as special type of priests. The homosexuals are priests of Cybele. So now everything has

come back to the pure image of that. But feminism didn't start yesterday and doesn't start today. Feminism started with titanism. The modernity was metaphysically feminist, because materialist, because orientated against this heroic type of patriarchy, of Indo-European culture. Bourgeois is feminist class already because it is not warrior and it is not worker. It is parasitic class. That is the worst form of feminine nature. It is not Indo-European or Christian concept of femininity. It is something completely different. It is Cybelian femininity. And Werner Sombart has said that capitalism began with the mistresses because when the people had wives, they were not so obliged to have more and more money, but having mistresses, they were obliged to participate in the speculations more and more because they needed excessive amounts of money, and mistresses were parasites that demanded more and more with no work and so on. According to Werner Sombart, that was a kind of motivation of capitalist development of capitalist society. It is anecdotal but it is sociological anecdote.

All our science is feminist because it is materialist and Cybelian. We are living in the world of Cybele in the modernity. We will speak about that later tomorrow in the last session of lectures, but we are living inside of this kind of civilization. The moment of noomahia we are living in is the moment of revenge of pre-Indo-European existential horizon, artificially with bourgeois, organic but very ancient with our scientific world vision, based on this lowest level of the peasant identity of European peasantry. So we have a kind of special image now of modernity that is explained as well with Christian vision. That is the end of Katehon. The Katehon has fallen. The Katehon was the king, the tsar, the emperor that defended traditional society and that was defeated by modern political system with democracy, national state, globalization today. And that was the same fate for Christian faith. That was the fate for all three traditional functions, because there are less and less peasants. We have no peasants in Europe. We are losing them. Everybody is citizen. Everybody is bourgeois (poor bourgeois proletarian or rich bourgeois). We are living precisely in the post-Katehonian cycle. That is when Satan is liberated and when there is a kind of intrusion of underground tendency that we see around us. So everything fits well in this noological analysis. Now we see that this noology could appear a little bit abstract, a little bit too metaphysical, has to do with the reality we're living in. We are inside of this noomahia. We are a part of this fight and the battle of the Logos. We could not be free from that. We are defined absolutely. Everything in us is defined by this moment of noomahia. We consider the reality as we are taught, as it is imposed. We could not deal with reality as such. We are dealing with reality through a type of reading, through a paradigm. And this paradigm is defined now by the Logos of Cybele.

But the knowledge that there are two other Logos helps us to see relativity of modernity and to put the modernity into the context of noology and to define as well the geosophical place we are in. So if France and England were the first in order to promote this in the geosophy of Europe, Latin worlds and Austrian empire resisted against them. Russia resisted more than other. Ottoman Empire resisted because that was as well traditional society. But when traditional empires had fallen, new modern states appeared. And being modern, they were doomed if we think they could transmit traditional spirit. Modernity and tradition are incompatible. Creating a national state instead of a traditional kingdom, we are already

doomed. The creation of modern state, Russian or Serbian, is the end of Russia and Serbia. That will be the state, modern but not Russian and not Serbian. What is modern could not be really Serbian or Russian or German. It is already simulacrum. It is already something Cybelian. That is why, anticipating the next lecture, maybe that could explain as well some aspects of modern Serbian history, of Yugoslavia, Serbia, because after liberating from Ottoman Empire that was traditional, that was the chance for revival and the chance was lost (for many reasons). In the next lecture, we will maybe openly discuss that (I have some concept). But in order to finish, I think that noology and geosophy now gives us the key to interpret the world we live in.

Introduction: The Aims and Tasks of Noomakhia

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The open triadic method

The Noomakhia series consists of five books written methodically and following an initial plan. This first book, Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, and Cybele, represents the philosophical part which establishes and describes the method that lies at the heart of all of Noomakhia. A number of preliminary remarks should be expressed regarding this first book.

First of all, we consider Noomakhia, especially this first book, Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, and Cybele, to be a continuation of another book: In Search of the Dark Logos [1]. We believe that this search has been initiated, but left unfinished, and, who knows, maybe it can never be finished. But it is important that we recognize the persistent need to continue it. As follows, the topics, plots, and trajectories designated in In Search of the Dark Logos will be further developed here in different directions, and perhaps with unexpected consequences. We propose to let the fundamental intuition which lies at the heart of this book unfold of its own will and freely, and we take upon ourselves the conscious risk of such leading to horizons and topoi which justifiably evoke fear and even horror. In this sense is conceived this open exposition, which reflects the landscapes grasped by the intellect over the course of active and free contemplation. We are moving forward in the “search for the dark logos.” And this is the goal.

Secondly, we are presented with the vitally important question of retrieving Plato, Platonism, and Neoplatonism. We see in Plato not only a philosopher or founder of an individual school, i.e., a phenomenon to be considered alongside other philosophers and other schools, but we are convinced that Plato represents the focus of philosophy as such. He yields the very paradigm of philosophy which all other philosophers are left with comprehending or interpreting. But in order to fully recognize this approach, it is necessary to consciously embrace the standpoint of Platonism or some other philosophico-religious doctrine based on the ontology of eternity. The philosophy of New Time (modernity) dismantled eternity as a “dubious hypothesis”, as a “myth”, as a remnant of the “not-yet-scientific”, as an “archaic” style of thinking. It was replaced with the ontology of time – history, process, development, evolution, etc. In this case, Plato and Platonism came to be associated with a temporal point or moment, and all of Platonism’s theses were interpreted on the basis of the knowledge attained later over the course of the further shaping of philosophy. Therein, with the onset of New

Time, Plato is treated like the discourse of children or teenagers – albeit genius, but limited. But everything is completely different if we treat Plato like his contemporaries or he himself did. If he spoke of eternity, god, and ideas, then we should live through and experience these ourselves – as eternity, gods, and ideas – without the smallest tint of conditionality or comedy. Is this possible? We will learn if this is possible only once we try to perceive Plato and Platonism directly, and if we become Platonists in the fullest sense of the word. Whether we will succeed in importing the dimension of eternity into the epochs of Modernity and Post-Modernity, which are explicitly and implicitly founded on the rejection of such, is an open question. In order to undertake such an attempt, it is necessary to accomplish a fundamental revolution in consciousness – a Platonist revolution. We can only approach Platonism, even purely theoretically, if we perceive such as absolute truth demanding our adaptation to it, and not its adaptation to our understanding. This is what we began in *In Search of the Dark Logos*, in the section “Open Platonism”, and we will continue this in the present work.

Thirdly, studying Platonism (by means of deep philosophical empathy, plunging into Platonism itself, and assimilating its elements) implores us to describe the structures of the light logos, the intellectual worlds of Apollo. This is necessary in order to more clearly understand the structures of the “dark logos” and their differences with those of the light logos. Along with this, as shown in our book *In Search of the Dark Logos*, we will encounter a number of philosophical plots, topics, and methods which allow us to advance the hypothesis that there exists an even more hidden “black logos”, the Logos of the Great Mother (Cybele), or “black philosophy.” The dark logos of Dionysus thus contrasts not only with the light logos of Apollo, but also with the black logos of Cybele. Thus, our goal is to further study into this black logos, this “third logos” which least of all resembles a logos itself, but rather “matter”, “space”, “autonomous corporeality”, the “insurgent void”, or even “madness.” Here we arrive at a very disturbing zone of ontology and gnosiology which, nonetheless, is up for decisive mastery and conceptualization within the framework of our overall philosophical program. This is the question of Dionysus and Cybele, their correspondences, differences, contrasts, and relation.

In the following four books of *Noomakhia* (*The Logos of Europe: Mediterranean Civilization in Time and Space*, *Border Civilizations*, *On the Other Side of the West: Part I – The Indo-European Civilizations of Iran and India*, and *On the Other Side of the West: Part II – China, Japan, Africa, and Oceania*) we will switch our study’s focus and transition to the subject of the horizontal multiplicity of logoi (whereas in this first part we focus on studying the vertical multiplicity). Over the course of our study, the following tasks will be accomplished.

We must decipher the correlation between the existential category of Dasein (Heidegger) and the multiplicity of cultures and their logoi. This requires constructing an existential structure for each concrete Dasein, clarifying the identity of each society we examine and the correspondence between this deep identity and the layers presented by each civilization’s logos – their ontological, or even better

(if there is such), “fundamental-ontological” levels [2].

We will illustrate several examples of how existential structures are shaped into cultural complexes of philosophy, myths, metaphysics, rites, etc. in the context of large spaces with developed or, on the contrary, implicit self-reflection (on the basis of the large-scale reconstructions of ancient cultures in the works of Leo Frobenius, Oswald Spengler, George Dumézil, Mircea Eliade, Károly Kerényi, René Guénon, Julius Evola, and other theoreticians of the civilizational approach which offer broad generalizing models), or in the context of more narrow (spatial and historical) borders [3]. The aim is to demonstrate how the concrete historical logoi of this or that culture are built on the foundations of different existential structures and reflect distinguishing, original combinations of the elements of the three vertical logoi. At the same time, we will not restrict our aims to necessarily reducing the logoi of different civilizations to our earlier proposed triadic system of Apollo, Dionysus, and Cybele. We are ready to, upon meeting different cultures, religions, and peoples, encounter the most unexpected combinations and variations which might confirm or deny our initial model of three logoi, correct it, or even, perhaps, refute it. We would least of all want to project a dry, deductive model onto the living and dynamic wealth of diverse cultures. We are ready to reconsider our method if it turns out inapplicable in this or that situation. And in such a case, we agree to restricting the reconstruction of this or that society, ethnos, or collective’s civilizational (horizontal) logos and presenting such as is (tel quel) without distorting our starting points. In this consists the openness of Noomakhia as a project. Setting off with our triadic approach based in Platonism (albeit freely interpreted and substantially re-conceptualized, especially with regards the problem of $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$, “matter” and the feminine element in metaphysics, ontology and cosmology), we will attempt to construct a noological model for all the civilizations we examine. If this is successful, we will consolidate our original position; if this method requires revision and refinement, then we are ready to carry out such; if it turns out to be altogether inapplicable, then we are even ready to desist and proceed to search for a new one based in contemplating the nature and structure of the difficulties and obstacles which we might encounter.

On the “father of all”

The title of Noomakhia, which literally means “war of the mind” (Noomachy) [4] – and which can also be conceived of as “war within the mind”, “war of minds”, or even “war against the mind” – is intended to emphasize the conflictual nature of logoi structures as well as the multiplicity of noetic fields in each of which surprises, conflicts, aporias, struggles, contradictions, and opposition lie in wait for us. The field of thinking is the field of warfare [5]: thoughts wage ceaseless wars not only against phenomenality, matter, and their own reorganization into elements (whether existing or not is an open question), natural law, dispersion, non-structurality escaping the “control” of multiplicity, etc., but also against other types of thoughts, other thoughts, and the complex diversity of vertical and horizontal, noetic and noeric chains which permeate the reality of the world on different planes and different geometries. Wars between people, including even the most cruel and bloody, are but pale comparisons to the wars

of the gods, titans, giants, elements, demons, and angels. And these, in turn, are but figures illustrating even more formidable and profound wars unfolding in the Mind, in the sphere of the Nous and its limits in which the Mind itself borders the zone of Madness. Thus, everything is Noomachy, even that which is bigger and came first of all – ὑπερπαντα. War, according to Heraclitus, is the father of all (πολεμος πατηρ παντων). Indeed, it is about this, the “father of all”, that Noomakhia is written.

[1] Dugin, A.G. V poiskakh temnogo Logosa. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2013.

[2] The meaning of the Heideggerian term “fundamental-ontology” and its differences with the classical ontologies of Western European philosophy are described in our first book on Heidegger. See Dugin, Martin Heidegger: Filosofia Drugovo Nachala (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2010), translated into English as Martin Heidegger: The Philosophy of Another Beginning (Arlington: Radix/Washington Summit, 2014).

[3] Particularly applied to Russian culture, we already began such work in our second book on Heidegger, Martin Heidegger: Vozmozhnost’ russkoi filosofii (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2011). This will be continued here in the third book, Border Civilizations, which is partly devoted to the Russian logos and particularly the sophiology and culture of the Silver Age.

[4] From the Greek words νοῦς (mind, spirit, intellect, cognition, thinking) and μάχη (war, battle, fight, struggle).

[5] The French poet Arthur Rimbaud justifiably wrote about this in his work *Une Saison en Enfer* (“A Season in Hell”): *Le combat spirituel est aussi brutal que la bataille d’hommes* [“Spiritual combat is just as brutal as the battle of men”].

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Introduction to Noomakhia: Voiny uma – Tri Logosa: Apollon, Dionis, Kibela [Noomakhia: Wars of the

Mind – Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, and Cybele] (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2014).

Letter to the American People on Ukraine

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Letter to the American People on Ukraine

In this difficult hour of serious trouble on our Western borders, I would like to address the American people in order to help you understand better the positions of our Russian patriots which are shared by the majority of our society.

Difference Between the two Meanings of Being American (In the Russian View)

1. We distinguish between two different things: the American people and the American political elite. We sincerely love the first and we profoundly hate the second.

2. The American people has its own traditions, habits, values, ideals, options and beliefs that are their own. These grant to everybody the right to be different, to choose freely, to be what one wants to be and can be or become. It is wonderful feature. It gives strength and pride, self-esteem and assurance. We Russians admire that.

3. But the American political elite, above all on an international level, are and act quite contrary to these values. They insist on conformity and regard the American way of life as something universal and obligatory. They deny other people the right to difference, they impose on everybody the standards of so called "democracy", "liberalism", "human rights" and so on that have in many cases nothing to do with the set of values shared by the non-Western or simply not North-American society. It is an obvious contradiction with inner ideals and standards of America. Nationally the right to difference is assured, internationally it is denied. So we think that something is wrong with the American political elite and their double standards. Where habits became the norms and contradictions are taken for logic. We cannot understand it, nor can we accept it: it seems that the American political elite is not American at all.

4. So here is the contradiction: the American people are essentially good, but the American elite is essentially bad. What we feel regarding the American elite should not be applied to the American people and vice versa.

5. Because of this paradox it is not so easy for a Russian to express correctly his attitude towards the USA. We can say we love it, we can say we hate it – because both are true. But it is not easy to always express this distinction clearly. It creates many misunderstandings. But if you want to know what Russians really think about the USA you should always keep in mind this remark. It is easy to manipulate this semantic duality and interpret anti-Americanism of Russians in an improper sense. But with these clarifications in mind all that you hear from us will be much better understood.

A Short Survey of Russian History

1. The American Nation was born with capitalism. It didn't exist in the Middle Ages. The ancestors of Americans had not experienced an American Middle Age, but a European one. So that is a feature of America. Maybe that's the reason why Americans sincerely think that Russian Nation was born with communism, with the Soviet Union. But that is a total misconception. We are much older than that. The Soviet period was just a short epoch in our long history. We existed before the Soviet Union and we are existing after the Soviet Union. So in order to understand Russians (and Ukrainians as well) you should take into consideration our past.

2. Russians consider Ukraine as being part of the Greater Russia. That was historically so – not by the conquest, but by the genesis of Russian Statehood that started precisely in Kiev. Around Kiev our people and our State were constructed in the IX century. It is our center, our first beloved capital. Later in the XII-XIII centuries different parts of Kievian Russia were more or less independent with two main rivals – the Western principalities Galitsia and Wolyn and the Eastern principality of Vladimir (which later became Moscow) existing. All of these areas were populated by the same nation, Eastern Slavs, all of whom were Orthodox Christian. But the princes of the West were more engaged in European politics and they had more direct contact with Western Christianity and relatively less with the Eastern branches. The title of Great Princes was held in the East by royalty who were considered the masters of the whole of Russia (not always de facto but de jure). In the Mongol period the West as well as the East of our Russian principalities were held under the Golden Horde. Eastern Russia was more or less solid and its power grew around the new capital Moscow. After the fall of the Tartars the rule of the Moscow principality affirmed itself as a regional hegemon that was confirmed by the fall of Byzantine Empire. Hence the doctrine of Moscow as the Third Rome.

The destiny of the Western area was quite different. It was incorporated first in a Lithuanian State that later became Polish. The Orthodox western Russians were put under Catholic rule. The earlier main principalities – Galitsia and Wolyn were fragmented and have lost any trace of independence. Some parts were under Lithuania, others under Austria and Hungary, a third belonged to Romania. But all that concerns us now is only the Right-Bank of modern Ukraine. The Left Bank was peopled by Cossacks – the nomad population common to the all lands of Novorossia, space that include Eastern and South-Eastern Ukraine and South Western Russia. Crimea was at that time under Ottoman rule.

3. The growth of the Moscovit Empire integrated first all the Cossack lands (Novorossia) and little by little other territories peopled by Western Russians liberating them from the Poles and Germans. The Moscovit princes believed that they were restoring Old Russia, Kievan Russia uniting all Orthodox Slavs – Eastern and Western in this unique Kingdom.

4. During the XVIII – XIX century the unification of the Western Russian lands was accomplished and in many battles the Moscovit Emperors had finally taken Crimea from the Ottoman Turks.

5. In WWI the Germans conquered the Western Russian lands. It didn't last long. After that came the October Revolution and the Empire was split into many parts with new nations being born into existence. There was an attempt to construct a Ukrainian nation by different people – Petlyura, Makhno and Levitsky who tried to found three ephemeral States. These States were attacked by Whites and Reds and fought among themselves. Finally the Bolsheviks restored the lands of the Tsarist Empire and proclaimed the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union then artificially created the Ukrainian Republic consisting of Western Russia (Galitsia, Wolyn) and Southern Russia (Novorossia). Later in the 1960's to that the Republic of Crimea was added. So in this Republic were united three main ethnic groups: Western Russians, the descendants of the Galitsia / Wolyn principalities; the Cossacks / Great Russian population of Novorossia; the Crimea peopled by Great Russians and the rest of the pre-Russian Tartars. This Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic was created by the Bolsheviks and was the origin of modern Ukraine. This Ukraine declared independence in 1991 after the split of the USSR. More than that the declaration of independence provoked this split.

6. So modern Ukrainians have three lines of descent – Western Russian, Cossacks, Great Russian and a small Tartar minority in the Crimea.

Ukrainian Identity and the two Geopolitical Options

1. The contradiction of Ukraine consists in the multiplicity of identities. Just after the declaration of the new state – the modern Ukraine in 1991 – the question of pan-Ukrainian identity arose. Such a State and nation never existed in history. So the nation had to be constructed. But the three main identities were very different. Crimea populated by Greater Russians along with most parts of Novorossia which were clearly attracted to the Russian Federation. The Western Russians claimed to be the core of a very specific “Ukrainian nation” that they imagined in order to serve their cause. The Western Russians who partly supported Hitler in WWII (Bandera, Shukhevich) possessed and still possess strong ethnic identity where the hatred toward Great Russians (as well as toward Poles to a lesser scale) plays a central role in this identity. This can be traced to the past rivalry of the two Russian feudal principalities projected onto imperial times and followed by Stalin’s purges. These purges were directed against all ethnic groups, but Western Russians read it as the revenge of the Great Russians on them (Stalin was Georgian and the Bolsheviks were internationalists). So the chosen identity of the newly created State of Ukraine was exclusively Western Russian (purely Galitsia / Wolyn style) with no place for a Novorossia and Great Russian identity.

2. This particularity was expressed in two opposite geopolitical options: Western or Eastern, Europe or Russia. The Western lands of Ukraine were in favor of European integration, the Eastern and Crimea in favor of strengthening relations with Russia. The men from Galtsya were dominant in the political elite presenting a Ukraine with only one identity – a Western one – and denying any attempt of the South and East to express their own vision. In the Western Ukraine anti-sovietism was deeply rooted as well as certain complaisance with the ideas of Bandera and Shukhevich who were considered as national heroes of a new Ukraine. The hatred toward Great Russians was dominant and all anti-Russian xenophobic rhetoric hailed.

3. In the East and South soviet values were still solid and Great Russian identity was in turn the overwhelming feeling. But the East and South were passive and their political power was limited. Still the population regularly expressed their choice giving their votes to pro-Russian or at least not so openly Russo-phobic or pro-Western politicians.

4. The challenge for Ukrainian politicians therefore was how to keep this contradictory society together always balancing between these two opposite parts. Each part demanded completely irreconcilable choices. The Westerners insisted on a European direction, Easterners and Southerners on a Russian one. All of the Presidents of the new Ukraine were unpopular, almost to the point of being hated precisely because they were absolutely unable to resolve this problem that had no solution at all. If you please one half of the population immediately you are hated by the other half. In this situation Westerners were more active and vigorous and partly succeeded in imposing their version of a pan-Ukrainian

identity on all of the political space of the country – with the considerable help of Western Europe and above all the USA.

Events and Their Meaning

1. Now we have approached the present crisis. The Orange revolution of 2004 was made by Westerners who challenged the legal victory of Victor Yanukovitch who was considered the candidate of the East. A Third round of elections (against all democratic norms) was revolutionarily imposed in order to give the power to the Western candidate (Yushchenko). Four years later new elections gave the Western President only 4% of the votes and the Eastern candidate Yanukovitch was elected. This time his victory was so obvious that nobody could challenge it.

2. Yanukovitch led the politics of balance. He was not really pro-Russian but didn't respond to all demands of the West either. He was not very lucky and effective, trying to trick Putin and Obama, disappointing both as well as Ukrainians of any side. He was an opportunist without a real integral strategy, which was almost impossible to develop in a society with a split personality and a split identity. He reacted more than acted.

3. Next, when he made a hesitating and reluctant step toward Russia, abstaining from signing the preparation Treaty of a distant entrance in EU, the opposition (Westerners) revolted. That was the reason Maidan was founded. The revolt was initially that of the West against the East and South. So its russophobic and Nazi nostalgic features are essential to its existence.

4. The opposition received huge support from the Western countries – above all from the USA. The role of America in all these events was decisive and the will to overthrow a pro-Russian President was shown by American representatives to be firm and strong. Now the fact that snipers who killed most of victims in the rioting were not those of Yanukovitch is exposed. It is clear that they were part of the USA's plan for revolution in the Ukraine and part of a plot to escalate the conflict.

5. The Maidan opposition waged revolution, overthrew Yanukovitch who ran from the country to Russia, and quite illegally seized power in Kiev. There was an illegal putsch that brought the completely illegal junta to power.

6. The first steps of the Westerns after seizure of power were:

- * declaration of wishing entrance into NATO
- * attacks on the use of the Russian language
- * a plea to be accepted in the EU
- * a refusal for Russia to continue to have a Navy base in Sebastopol (Crimea)
- * the appointment of corrupted tycoons as governors in the East and South Ukraine.

7. In response to these things Putin took control over Crimea based on the decrees of the only legal President of the Ukraine, Yankovitch. He also received from the Russian Parliament the right to deploy in Ukraine the Russian army. Crimean authorities were recognized by Moscow as the representatives of their land and Putin has plainly refused any relations with the Kiev junta.

8. So now we are here.

Short Prognosis

1. Where will this lead? Logically Ukraine as it was during the 23 years of its history has ceased to exist. It is irreversible. Russia has integrated Crimea and declared herself the guarantor of the liberty of the freedom of choice of the East and South of Ukraine (Novorossia).

2. So in the near future there will be the creation of two (at least) independent political entities corresponding to the two identities mentioned earlier. The Western Ukraine with their pro-NATO position and at the same time a ultra-nationalist ideology and Novorossia with a pro-Russian (and pro-Eurasian) orientation (apparently without any ideology, just like Russia herself). The West of Ukraine will

protest trying to keep hold over the East and South. It is impossible by democratic means so the nationalists will try to use violence. After a certain time the resistance of the East and South will grow and / or Russia will intervene.

3. The USA and NATO countries will support by all means the Westerns and the Kiev junta. But in reality this strategy will only worsen the situation. The essence of the problem lays here: if Russia intervenes in the affairs of the State whose population (the majority) regard this intervention as illegitimate, the position of the USA and NATO States would be natural and well founded. But in this situation the population of the East and South of Ukraine welcomes Russia, waits for it, pleads for Russia to come. There is a kind of civil war in Ukraine now. Russia openly supports the East and South. The USA and NATO back the West. The Westerns are trying to get all Ukraine to affirm that not all the population of the East and South is happy with Russia. This is quite true. Also true is that not all of the population of the West is happy with Right Sector, Bandera, Shukhevich and the rule of tycoons. So if Russia would invade the Western parts of Ukraine or Kiev that could be considered as a kind of illegitimate aggression. But the same aggression is in present circumstances the position of the USA that strives to help the Kiev junta take the control of the East and South. It is perceived as an illegitimate act of aggression and it will provoke fierce resistance.

Conclusion

1. Now here is what I would say to the American people. The American political elite has tried in this situation as well as in many others to make the Russians hate Americans. But it has failed. We hate the American political elite that brings death, terror, lies and bloodshed everywhere – in Serbia, in Afghanistan, in Iraq, in Libya, in Syria – and now in Ukraine. We hate the global oligarchy that has usurped America and uses her as its tool. We hate the double standard of their politics where they call “fascist” innocent citizens without any feature resembling fascist ideology and in the same breath deny the open Hitlerists and Bandera admirers the qualification of “Nazi” in the Ukraine. All that the American political elite speaks or creates (with small exceptions) is one big lie. And we hate that lie because the victims of this lie are not only ourselves, but also you the American people. You believe them, you vote for them. You have confidence in them. But they deceive and betray you.

2. We have no thoughts of or desire to hurt America. We are far from you. America is for Americans as President Monroe used to say. For Americans interests and not for others. Not for Russians. Yes, this is quite reasonable. You want to be free. You and all others deserve it. But what the hell you are doing in the capital of ancient Russia, Victoria Nuland? Why do you intervene in our domestic affairs? We follow law and logic, lines of history and respect identities, differences. It is not an American affair. Is it?

3. I am sure that the separation line between Americans and the American political elite is very deep. Any honest American calmly studying the case will arrive to the conclusion: "let them decide for themselves. We are not similar to these strange and wild Russians, but let them go their own way. And we are going to go our own way." But the American political elite has another agenda: to provoke wars, to mix in regional conflicts, to incite the hatred of different ethnic groups. The American political elites sacrifice American people to causes that are far from you, vague, uncertain and finally very very bad.

4. The American people should not choose to be with Ukrainians (Western Russians – Galitsya, Wolyn) or with Russians (Great Russians). That is not the case. Be with America, with real America, with your values and your people. Help yourselves and let us be what we are. But the American political elite makes the decisions instead of You. It lies to you, it dis-informs you. It shows faked pictures and falsely stages events with completely imagined explanations and idiotic commentary. They lie about us. And they lie about you. They give you a distorted image of yourself. The American political elite has stolen, perverted and counterfeited the American identity. And they make us hate you and they make you hate us.

5. This is my idea and suggestion: let us hate the American political elite together. Let us fight them for our identities – you for the American, us for the Russian, but the enemy is in both cases the same – the global oligarchy who rules the world using you and smashing us. Let us revolt. Let us resist. Together. Russians and Americans. We are the people. We are not their puppets.

Alexander Dugin (b. 1962) is one of the best-known writers and political commentators in post-Soviet Russia. In addition to the many books he has authored on political, philosophical and spiritual topics, he currently serves on the staff of Moscow State University, and is the intellectual leader of the Eurasia Movement. For more than a decade, he has also been an adviser to Vladimir Putin and others in the Kremlin on geopolitical matters.

His first English language book, the Fourth Political Theory, is available here.

<http://openrevolt.info/2014/03/08/alexander-dugin-letter-to-the-american...>

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 4). Logos of Cybele

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

In order to understand better how Indo-European culture came to the sedentary stage and what happened during this shift and this change in the structure in the moment of Noomakhia, we must consider what was the existential horizon that was around Turan. So the Turanian tribes came to Eastern Europe, to Anatolia, to Balkans, to territory of Elam in Iran (Persia), and to Indian space. And these spaces were not empty or void. There existed some other civilizations, some other existential horizons with different kind of (we presume, or maybe the same but we will see now...) proper moment of Noomakhia. What were these pre-Indo-European civilizations of Europe, Balkans, Anatolia, Persia, and India? I follow here, as well as in the first and previous lecture, the concept of Marija Gimbutas, that affirmed that there existed in Anatolia, Balkans, and Europe before the coming of the Indo-Europeans, a very ancient civilization of the Great Goddess.

According to Marija Gimbutas, Lepenski Vir, Vinča, Karanovo Gumelnița, and other archeological places belonged to the civilization of the Great Mother. This civilization was very similar to Çatalhöyük site, in Anatolia, in Modern Day Turkey. The oldest levels of this civilization belong to the 7-8,000 years before Christ. The first waves of the Turanian Indo-European population was 3,000 years before Christ. And so this civilization existed before the appearance of the Indo-Europeans. In the case of Europe, there is the name or concept used by Marija Gimbutas of 'Old Europe' or 'Paleo-European.' (Paleo is a Greek word for 'old.') This was a civilization, according to Gimbutas, with the center in the Balkans, because the oldest findings and archeological sites were discovered precisely in the Balkans, in the territory of Serbia and Bulgaria and around there; Karanovo, Starčevo, Tisza, Körös, Pannonia, around there. And this civilization was the civilization of the Mother. We see feminine figures and no male figures, and the concept of the tombs, without weapons. These were sedentary type of ancient agricultural societies with completely different structure than Turanian Indo-European tribes.

I suggest as well, Bachofen, who has written the book called 'Mutterrecht' ('The Law of Mother'), a classical and absolutely necessary work. In this work of the 19th century, he explored all the matriarchal topics in the tradition of the Greek civilization and the Anatolian civilizations; Lydian, Lycian, Carian, Phrygian, Hattian, and so on. And if we consider Bachofen's big volume, or Marija Gimbutas, or many other authors, it is almost conventional wisdom. There are debates on who were these Paleo-European? What modern people are the continuator of them? The most probable is the pre-Indo-European Pelasgian population, Etruscan population, Hattian population (Pre-Hittite population), as well as the

modern Caucasian population of Georgian, of Dagestanian, of Avar population, Chechen population, and Abkhazian population were the continuator of this pre-Indo-European Paleo-European population.

But what is important is that everyone agrees that before these waves of Turanian Indo-European Kurganian culture, there existed a different civilization with a different Logos. And when we study this Logos not only from the symbols but from some tales embedded in the European Hittite or Phrygian or Hellenic or Latin civilization, we could reconstruct, in main features, these pre-Indo-European cultures.

The main features of this culture are the following. First of all, it is Chthonian, Earthly civilization. There is no idea of the Heavenly Father or the Light coming down from the Heaven. There is the Birth of the Great Mother. That is Great Mother Earth and Water, that has given the light to everything that exists. So the logic is quite opposite. There is a kind of primordial substance, that gives birth to everything else. And the figure of the Mother, the most ancient figures, they have the lower part of the body described in realistic way, but there is no head, no face, no hands. So the upper part of the body is not described because it was not the center of attention. The bearing belly of the Great Mother was the center of attention because it was the origin and the end. That was the tomb as well as the belly that gives the life. That was the center of this civilization and the center of sacrality.

And that kind of civilization, for example, had as well, big cities. Big cities with the cults and sacred places in center but without a wall. That was a completely different city. If we consider Indo-European cities, they were also with walls. This was a sign that it was a military construction. It was not developed from the sedentary village or some different villages growing, but was a kind of artificially created something in order to conquer the territory. So there are 2 types of cities; Indo-European Turanian (with walls) and without walls (Logos of Cybele). The city without walls, as something peaceful, sedentary, and agrarian. This was a sign of that. Agrarian culture was made by women. There is the term 'Hoe' which is the instrument to prepare the field for the seed, which was a purely female tool. The earth was labored by the women. Because they were linked to the earth, they were considered to be the mother, the creator. And they were the workers on the earth with these hoes. These hoes were not too heavy and so were easy to manipulate. And there were no animals laboring the fields. The fields were small and were labored by women. And so now we have pure type of the civilization based on completely different structure. That is the sedentary civilization; not nomadic. Matriarchy; not Patriarchy. Chthonian; not Heavenly. Based on the cult of the mother; not of the father. Mother is earthly, Father is Heavenly. There is no heavenly father in this pure type of Cybelian civilization. There is only Mother that creates, that nurtures, that destroys and that gives birth again. So everything goes from the mother and returns to the mother. And that gives a completely different image of the cosmos, where the inner space of the earth is the center. It is something hidden. It is not the open space of the sky. It is not the fire, it is water. It is not the day, it is night. It is not open, it is closed. It is not male, it is female, something that goes from inside as the woman gives birth from inside to outside.

And the belly of the woman is the image of the cosmos, of the world. And the world is constructed differently. It is a different world. The center is not above, it is beneath. It is under earth. The earth is not a hard surface in order to come down and come back. It is a completely different vision. It is inconceivable for Platonist's version because it is not Platonist's world. It is a completely different picture of the world, different relations. There are roots, there are trees growing from the earth, not from the sky. Everything is based on the construction that goes from beneath the earth, from underground. It is not cremation, it is inhumation (putting in the tomb). It is earthly and not heavenly. That is the Kingdom of Mothers and not the Kingdom of Fathers. But that is not a direct opposition to it. It is a different perspective. For example, we could not receive the concept of Matriarchy if we simply change plus and minus with Patriarchy. It's something different. For example, Patriarchy or Indo-European civilization is based on the line or the ray of the sun. But here, everything is based on the curve or the spire. So, you go to the center. You don't kill by direct hit but you try to get into the trap and to suffocate in a mild manner. It's not a radical cut of the throat, it is purely unremarkable and comfortable suffocation of the victim. So that is a completely different version of death and life. There is no immortal soul coming from the sky. That is eternal birth and death of the same substance, recombined in a different way. So that is matrilineal society as well, where the affiliation to the family is defined by the Mother and the Father is unknown or the father is not so much important. Because the father does not give life. The mother gives life. And in some radical cases, there is no father, because the idea that the father is linked to the conception of the child is a patriarchal one. In matriarchy, it was the woman who could bring the child, having relations with winged creatures or with serpents or with invisible spirits, as incubus coming through the night in the dreams. So, the conception of the child was considered to be very special with no help of the father. The father didn't exist in that as something important.

So the figures of the Great Mother were surrounded by the beasts; two beasts, on the left and on the right of the Great Mother. Little by little, they obtained human features. They were half beast half man, and after that they were man. So the man was a kind of development of the ape, of the beast. So the creation was from the matter, the substance, the matriarchal giver of life. And we have a completely different version of symbolism. The serpent was the same as the male in that situation. The only concept of the male figure was the serpent. Something living inside of the Great Mother, or the fish. The son was the serpent and the husband was the serpent of this Great Mother, living inside of her, underground, and appearing on the surface and disappearing anew. So the serpent was absolutely positive but the serpent was a kind of absent male because in the concept of these purely matriarchal world visions as represented in the Phrygian myth of Cybele, there was the concept of the female androgyne (Agdistis in Greek). Agdistis was the female androgyne. She was female but why androgyne? Because she did not need anybody in order to conceive the child. So she was as well the father. This is the concept of the she-father, Agdistis in the Greek myth. And this Agdistis gave birth to Attis, the Anatolian hero. And being mother of Attis, she has fallen in love with Attis. The incestuous relations between mother and son are a basic feature of this matriarchal cycle and tale. But when Attis grew up,

he wanted to marry with a normal human woman. And this provoked the revenge and great jealousy of the Great Mother and she put the madness on Attis and he castrated himself and died. But in that time, Cybele in this myth, had sadness about the loss of Attis, and she resurrected Attis. And Attis became her priest. That was the origin of the castrated priests, called Gallus in Anatolia. And they created the town of emasculated castrated priesthood of the Great Mother. That was the origin of the orgies of the Great Mother, of Cybele. That was a kind of civilization of sedentary peaceful type, with blood victims and bloody sacrifices because the blood of the male priest was a kind of nourishment for the earth that helped to give crops and plants to grow and so on.

We could see this existential horizon of Ancient Old Europe (Pre Turanian Europe) with centers of civilization, with cities, with fields, with ceramics, with many objects and very developed civilization, with worship, cults, temples of the Great Mother. In the south we see traces of it in the stone, but we could imagine what was this civilization when all the buildings were from wood. There could have existed huge center in the Balkans and other places. What is interesting is that in Lepenski Vir, the people living around Lepenski Vir make the same floors as the time of Lepenski Vir culture, more than 5-6,000 years before Christ. The serbs, villagers, and peasants living in the same area now are making the same kind of floor. That is very interesting how constant, how stable these structures can be.

At the same time, many levels of the mythology of the Great Mother enter into the Patriarchal society, into the Greek mythology. This idea of castration of Cronus by Zeus as well is a part of this Matriarchal cycle and dethronement of Patriarchal Zeus of Cronus of Saturn, the elder, the oldest Titans. The Titans were a kind of matriarchal figures of the man in the previous tradition. All of these topics are very stable and they continued into the mythology and folk tales up to the present time. For example, there is an author called Gasparini (italian), who has written the book (3 volumes) 'On the Slavic Matriarchy' and he has found many matriarchal aspects in Slavic tradition; Balkanian, Serbian, Bulgarian, Russian, Czechs, and so on. These topics, we could find after thousands of years of domination of patriarchal Indo-European culture. So we are obliged to recognize that we are dealing, in European society, with two levels. Two existential horizons; one existential horizon we have identified as Turanian or Indo-European and we have described more or less in the general features, the structure of this verticality in the Indo-European system of values. And when the Indo-European tribes have conserved their nomadic tradition, going through the steppes of Turan, they lacked this second level. They had only one level (the level of their patriarchal civilization) but when they came through the Dnieper River, behind the Dnieper there was the Cucuteni-Trypillia culture of matriarchal type. And this produced a mixture between two existential horizons, and this was the kind of the moment of Noomahia, an encounter, a meeting between the Logos of Apollo, represented by Indo-European type of society, three functional and patriarchal, with the Logos of Cybele, represented by Paleo-European population that lived behind the Dnieper. And that was interesting that Marija Gimbutas affirms that that was precisely the border between two civilizations for many thousands of years. The Dnieper on the Eastern side was Turan and on the Western side began these kingdoms of the Great Mother.

In the case of Anatolia, little Asia, that was more or less the same with maybe the same type of Paleo-European population but to the West there was Dravidian population of a different kind. But this Dravidian population of ancient Iran, Pre-Indo-European and Ancient India, as well was of matriarchal type. Interesting. They were maybe from phenotype, they were different. Maybe they were not Paleo-European or nobody knows. They say they had dark skin but maybe they were darker type of the same Paleo-European, maybe they were completely different. But what is interesting is that from the point of Noology, they belong to the same type of Logos of Cybele that we could discover under the level of the Indo-European civilization, above all in India. In India it's clear that there is Vedic level of civilization and there is Pre-Vedic, which is matriarchy, chthonic, with center of Titans and female Goddesses and so on.

But at the same time, in Italy, Spain, and British Isles, we could find the traces of this matriarchal civilization. Or in Iberian Peninsula there is the Basques civilization, that is an origin of this matriarchal Paleo-European type. So, any kind of sedentary Indo-European civilization known now is the result of the mixture of two Noological types; the mixture of patriarchy and the Logos of Apollo linked to the Indo-European level and something other, a pre-Indo-European existential horizon. And we are dealing not only with the past but we are dealing with the present because existential horizon is not something that belongs to the material aspect of the things. Existential horizon is something that lives now. So we have this other very, very deep and hidden matriarchal existential horizon of Paleo-European civilization that was a kind of basis for sedentary Indo-European society. That is the most important result of Noological analysis of Indo-European culture. Every Indo-European society is based on the superposition of two existential horizons, so an existing Indo-European culture (Celtic, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Slavic, Greek, Iranian, or Indian), all of them have two existential levels. They are based on the Titanomachia, based on the Noomachia represented by this fight between the Logos of Apollo and the hidden, neglected, ignored, secret you could say, Logos of Cybele.

Friedrich Jünger has said that the order of the Olympian Gods is constructed over the shoulders and the heads of the Titans. So they are created not over nothing, or over a void, but there are Titans living at the bases of the Indo-European heroic societies. That is a living Cybelian existential horizon that we could find in European tradition, folk tales, myths, religions, rites, and psychology. Our tradition is double. Officially, we are Indo-Europeans. We have patriarchy, vertical structure of society. But secretly, in the night part of our society, we are matriarchal. We belong to this existential horizon of the Great Mother with peaceful, pacifist, and as well democratic and up to some situation matriarchal and democratic society, not organized by vertical male domination but much more mild society. And our identity of Indo-European peoples and culture should be regarded as double, essentially double.

Without the recognition of this second Pre-Indo-European level, we could not explain anything in our historical sequence because our European history, Iranian history, and Indian history is the continuing fight between two Logos. That is our moment of Noomahia. The Logos of Apollo came over the Logos of Cybele and that was the main event when Turanian nomadic tribes conquered the sedentary societies. They created something new, a new kind of society. It was officially Indo-European but secretly not so. That is the difference between Iran and Turan. Iran had this matriarchal horizon and Turan didn't have it. Iran against Turan in Ferdowsi, or in Avesta, or ethno-sociological or noological sense is something other than it appears. It is the sedentary nature of Indo-European society that shows that inevitably and necessarily there should be an encounter and assimilation of this second existential horizon, second dasein. And this dasein was conquered, was put under control, and was domesticated. It was a kind of domestication of Cybele, a kind of conquering of the female power. And putting over this female power, man as rulers. But patriarchy was the result of the very violent fight that still continues, because we are living in sedentary societies and we have inside our cultures this matriarchal Logos of Cybele that doesn't belong only to the past. So we are living in this two level society where the Titanomachia, the war between Gods and Titans, between Indo-European and Pre-Indo-Europeans, is still continuing. That is the most important fact of this noological analysis; that we are dealing with double level societies and cultures, not with uni-level as Turanian civilization.

And we could follow and trace this extremely important line in analyzing third function of Dumézil. Now we come back to this three functional theory. We see that the priests and the warriors, let's say, were turned into the ruling class in the sedentary Indo-European societies as they were. The warriors and our military are still Turanian. Our priests are still Turanians. They are male ascetics, priests, and warriors. Up to the present, our priests, our Christian priests, our army have continued to be morally and metaphysically Turanian. They are still purely patriarchal society and they were not so much affected by the sedentary. They continued to create the fortresses, to create the cult of the Sun God, the God of Father, the God of Sun. They continued to defend the hierarchical system of our political states that are the continuation of the same vertical structure. And they are not so much affected. They are affected but not so much. The priests and warriors have imposed language on the conquered people. They have imposed their Indo-European ideology. We are living under Indo-European ideology with the ruling class a continuator of these Turanian conquerors, charioteers. And all our culture, education, philosophy, ethics, aesthetics, everything, aesthetics of light, we are living officially in the Apollonian society.

But if we come back to the third function, we see in the Turanian society as the pure type of this Logos of Apollo, nomadic pastoralists. The people dealing with the big animals, with bulls, cows, and horses. It's very important because they are great, they are big. So in order to put them under control, you should be very strong and you have to have the space in order to feed them. So the pastoralist needs open space, needs the field, and the very strong male controller of them. But when they came to the sedentary way of life, these pastoralists, the third caste were a kind of economical caste, because warriors could only destroy or consume. They produced nothing. As well as priests, they produced

nothing. Everything that was produced, the richness, the economy, was in the hands of this third caste of cattlers and pastoralists. They were masters of the material aspect. They gave food and everything to the chiefs, to chieftains, to leaders, to the warriors and the priests. But they breed the cattle; they were occupied with the cattle. The pastoralists and cattlers were an economical class. And when they conquered the sedentary society, they introduced in this third caste all sedentary society. The peasants were the main type of this matriarchal society. But the peasants in the pure matriarchal society were women. Now that is the change of the sex of the gender of this sedentary society because the woman was replaced by the man. And the woman with the hoe was replaced by the man with the plow. And the field was labored by woman herself, but now it is done by the animal (domesticated horse or cow or bull) with the heavy plow that it is impossible for the woman to manage. And there is an iron end of the plow used in that. And so it is not gentle or mild relation with the earth, but it is violent relations with earth. And this is the appearance of the male figure in the agriculture, the male Indo-European peasant that replaced the previous peasant woman of Pre-Indo-European society. That was very important from an economic point of view because that was the shift from the cattle towards the grain, the wheat, and the plants. And that was as well assimilation and creation of mixture in the third function of the pure Turanian society and all the economical and as well social structure of Paleo-European society.

So we have very interest idea that origins of European peasantry, of all the sedentary peasants in all of Europe, was the Balkans and Anatolia (including German Peasants, Celt Peasants, Latin Peasants.) They came indirectly from the first poles of these matriarchal civilizations of Great Mother on the Balkans and Anatolia. And after that it was expansion. First it was expansion on the purely matriarchal civilization through all Europe. After that it was the wave of the European societies that created first mixed and after sedentary European, Indo-European society with the peasantry. But the origins and the sources of the old European peasantry were Balkanic and matriarchal. And we could introduce a very important concept of peasant dasein of Europe. In this peasant tradition that represented during history the absolute majority of our people, because the nobles, the priests and warriors were a minority. The majority of people always during all the stages were peasants. Peasantry had very serious and important aspect of the Pre-Indo-European tradition. So there is a continuation of the tradition of the Great Mother in European peasantry. That explains why, in our folk tales and traditions and so on, there are so many matriarchal topics and figures, hidden or open. Because on the level of the European peasantry, on the part of the third function of Indo-European society, was integrated many tales about serpents, about queens, about fairies, about rusalki, and other types of female spirits of different kinds (good or bad). All of them were kind of mirrors or sparks of the Great Mother figure.

It is important that when European tribes became sedentary, they assimilated this dimension, this existential horizon in their structure. Officially, there was a historical pact between the gainers and the losers. The civilization of the Great Mother had lost its Titanic battle against the Gods. On this victory is based all the historical consequences of European history. That was the history of how the Turanians had conquered the Old European (Paleo-European civilization), and all our ethical system is based on it.

But the conquered existential horizon, conquered dasein still lives and lived inside of our society, in the third function, that is the majority of our society. We could try to write the history of European peasantry as a special civilization, embedded in our official civilization. Our normal history is the deeds of our saints, our kings, and our aristocracy. We know almost nothing about the everyday life of the peasants. We celebrate only the highest level; the first two functions of Indo-European society. We know almost nothing about the everyday life or way of thinking or ideology of our peasantry. But only when there was a kind of renaissance of the national tradition in the fight against the Middle Ages and feudalism, we started to collect folklore. It was only the 18th and 19th century, only recently. And we have discovered that there was a huge amount of data of information of the tales, of the topics, a huge universe of archaic peasant tradition. And now we know them. But in the middle ages, that was outside of the sphere of interest of the learned castes and classes of the population.

We could identify and individuate this peasant universe as a meeting point between two existential horizons. Between the patriarchal horizon with the male figure that sows the grains and seeds but in Eastern Europe up to the 19th century, to gather crop was the privilege of the women. Not with great tools but with little tools (scythes and sickles). Only the weeds, the males were obliged to cut for the cattle. But the crops belonged to the women and it was necessary to cut with a sickle. So it was a continuation of the ancient tradition of the female. As well, in Serbia there were special rites when there was no rain. The women should accomplish special rites outside of man, outside of the villages, in order to provoke rain, accomplishing special ritual movement. Many traditions are linked with this matriarchal aspect.

In our European civilization, we have two existential horizons and two daseins. One is the Logos of Apollo represented by the official ideology, the functional ideology, and the other is the Logos of Cybele. That is very important in the shadow part, in our subconscious, in the mother tradition. It is a part of the second parallel, hidden, or secret ideology. It is not the void. It is an ideology that is present in our societies but is not obvious, is not explicit. It is an implicit Logos of Cybele but is still alive because we are living in the civilization with the huge part of agriculture system and economy because we continue to produce and to consume the agriculture and food and we are sedentary. This level which we could individuate put the concept of the Logos of Cybele, not to the ancient types, but the Logos of Cybele exists now inside of ourselves, because our society is partly based precisely on this moment of noomahia. But noomahia is a continuing process. We could not once and forever grant the victory of one logos. If the Logos of Apollo weakens, that means that some other pole will become stronger. If the patriarchy dissolves (which is the case now in modernity), the other counter-current begins to appear, becomes more and more explicit, not implicit. That is the most important result of this noological analysis.

When we speak about that, we have defined now two existential horizons, that are common to any Indo-European societies. We see that in the absolute majority of European society, that is the situation. But there are exceptions. One exception is Phrygian culture because precisely in Phrygian society there was a cult of the Great Mother of Cybele. Cybele was considered to be a Great Goddess in Indo-European society. That is an extremely important sign that in Indo-European context, the power of the Great Mother can be so strong that it could transform and re-interpret the figures of Indo-European ideology in a completely different way. So we shouldn't be too confident in the victory of the Gods. There are examples that the Titans can win, including in this common mixed type of the society with Indo-European domination. The same with Lykian. They are not Thracian but they are a continuator of Indo-European Hittite tradition. Lykian, Lycian, and Lydian, the other Anatolian people, they as well were matriarchal, with the cult of the Great Mother as the Phrygian. So we know the cases where and when the Great Mother wins. It is important that in Bachofen there are many examples precisely taken from some Greek colonies. Ionian Greeks and Aeolian Greeks were as well, up to a certain point, overcome by this pre-Greek tradition. When Dorian, the last from four Greek tribes, came to the Balkans, to the Peloponnese, and to the Greek space, they were pure androcratic, pure Turanians, Dorians. But previous Hellenistic tribes were more or less assimilated in this Minoan and Mycenaean mixed civilization where we see walls around the towns (Turanian feature) but with the temples of the Great Mother in the center as in ancient Mycenaean cities. So there is a mixture with a kind of revenge of the Great Mother. And only Dorian who have destroyed any achievement of this mixture of Ionian and Aeolian Greek civilization based on this mixture between two horizons, only Dorian coming precisely from Macedonia, from the Balkans, have brought with them something decisive element of the patriarchy. They were as fresh Turanians, pastoralists, pure, with androcracy, with no compromise with the Logos of Cybele. Their coming from the Northern Balkans to the South was 1200 years before Christ. But the first waves of Hellenic tribes were much earlier.

We see that there is a fight, there is a noomahia continuing, everlasting noomahia, and when you being absolutely Indo-European, you think that everything is already granted, you could discover to be completely controlled by the Great Mother that is dealing from inside, not from outside, but because it is assimilated in the sedentary type of culture, it begins the new semantic war, the war of interpretation. For example, it is not the replacement of God by Goddess or one God of the sky by the God of the underground of the Hell. Not at all. It would be too simple. No. It is the interpretation of the same figures, of the same symbols, of the same names. For example, there is Zeus, the great God, purely patriarchal, but there is the tale of the Cretan Zeus that is completely matriarchal. So you take one and the same God and you re-interpret it in a different way. Or for example, the same on the other side. You could interpret from the point of view, from the perspective of the Turanian horizon, the Goddess. She will become a kind of anelygynia - the Goddess as Athens, the Goddess purely of the male type, virgin, pure, fighting, and wise, completely different with no links with mothership, with no links with this power of the Earth, with no chthonian relations with the serpent. You can take the element from the horizon of the Logos of Cybele and re-interpret in the Logos of Apollo but you could make opposite. You could take Apollonian type, Zeus for example, and re-interpret it in the chthonic sense, in the case of the

Cretan Zeus. That is example of the mythology. That is the same for everything. There is a kind of conflict of interpretation that is inherent, implicit in all the Indo-European on and on. It is a kind of lasting process because we have the Logos of Cybele inside our culture. That was not the case for Turanians, pure Turanians. Living in their nomadic space in Eurasia, they were free from that because they hadn't contact.

There is, as well, a very important shift in the concept of the woman in these mixed types. Turanians, dealing with new sedentary concept, they had discovered that there are two women, not one. One woman they knew before, in the context of anelygynia, the woman as friend and as warrior. That was the friend from Turanian type. And there was the completely other woman, earthy woman, not masculine, but feminine woman, completely different type, that was considered as a kind of tribute, a kind of cradle, a kind of possession. So the friend and possession was the kind of bifurcation of the shape, of the image of the woman, coming from nomadic style of life to the sedentary style of life. There was woman as the friend, and as more or less the equal, and there was woman as the kind of belonging that belonged to you and maybe as well as a kind of enemy that you should submit and should appropriate and control. And that is always double the split in the image of the woman. That is reflected in the double kind of Goddess. The Goddess could be of one kind or other. They could conserve Turanian features as Athens or Diana or Artemis. And they could turn into Cybelian type as Demeter or Rhea or Gaia. Gaia is pure name for matriarchal type of woman. So there are two strategies; the strategy of conquest, control and submission and the woman becomes a kind of property, following ethical and juridical bases and laws. And there is the other woman, woman as friend. There is a kind of split in this image that is reflected in the many institutions of the society. And in any cases, this duality, for example, the chthonian deities were integrated in the third function. The third function was presented by female deities in these mixed types of cultures, Indo-European culture of the sedentary stage.

Now, we are prepared to understand what is the existential structure of the Old Indo-European society. We know now that there are two existential horizons, mixed, superposed on each other and what is important is that is a kind of conditions to study more any concrete Indo-European society (European, West European, East European, Iranian, or Indian). I have finished all these studies and have dedicated to French Logos, German Logos, Latin Logos, Greek Logos 2 books, English culture 1 book, Iranian culture 1 book, Indian culture 1 book. I have applied this concept of two horizons in order to test how this hermeneutics, how this interpretation works in concrete cases of each of these cultures. And how this superposition of two horizons affects the content and semantics and meanings of each of these people and cultures. And I could say that everywhere it works. Everywhere we could find both horizons. We could identify their interrelations, interactions, we could see the aspect where one horizons prevails and the other prevails in the other situations, in the concrete contexts, in the mythology, in the religion, in the science, in the world vision, because Logos affects everything.

At the end of this lecture, I would like to say something as an introduction to the next lecture, the fifth lecture, that maybe you could think about by yourself before tomorrow. If we put together the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Cybele in the mixture type of society, and if we could remember what I have said in the first lecture about the Logos of Dionysus, we could presume that precisely in this mixture, this mixed type of civilization, it is the space or the place where Dionysus appears, where Dionysus manifests itself, because that is precisely intersection of two horizons; vertical Logos of Apollo with all its structural content, Turanian content in the pure version, and the chthonian underground Logos of Cybele. When they meet, when they fight there is precisely the moment of noomahia where Dionysus appears. So the next lecture will be dedicated to the Logos of Dionysus.

Video: <https://www.geopolitica.ru/en/studio/introduction-noomahia-lecture-4-log...>

Maoism is too Modern for me

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Maoism is too Modern for me

Five Questions for Alexandr Dugin

1. Recent attacks on you especially from Glenn Beck in the United States label you a Fascist Racist I understand you to be a conservative communist (nationalist communist) and anti racist - is my understanding correct ?

I am certainly not "Fascist Racist". I am not Fascist (not Third Position). I am convinced anti-Racist. I hate racism as part of liberal Eurocentric and imperialist ideology. Most Westerners including human rights partisans – are definitively racists being universalists and sharing the vision of Modern Western civilization as normative one.

I defend the plurality of civilizations, the absence of the universal (Western) pattern of social development. I strongly oppose any kind of xenophobia and nationalism as the bourgeois artificial and essentially Modern construction.

I am not communist nor Marxist because I refuse the materialism of any kind and deny the progress. So much more correct to describe my views as Fourth Political Theory and traditionalism.

On the level of International Relations it is translated as the Theory of Multipolar World based on the vision of the pluralist architecture of the World based on the great spaces principle (Grossraum). I am against capitalism as a essential phenomenon of Modernity.

I strongly believe that Modernity is absolutely wrong and the Sacred Tradition is absolutely right. USA is the manifestation of all I hate – Modernity, westernization, unipolarity, racism, imperialism, technocracy, individualism, capitalism.

It is in my eyes the society of Antichrist. USA hates me – repressing, putting under sanctions (only for my ideas!), blaming, lying, organizing the deformation on the world scale (Glenn Beck is only small part of it).

But I accept all this patiently. If you are against the Modernity it is but logical the Modernity were against you.

2. In your Fourth Political Theory you owe much to the ontological theories of Martin Heidegger in which being is the fatherland a theory which allowed for a rebasing of Neo Fascism after the Second World War based on rootedness of being and not Nazis "scientific racism". This ontology gives ideological support to neo fascism and ethnic nationalism.

I cannot classify Heidegger as "neo-fascist". He is simply the greatest European thinker of XX century. I rate and consider him to be the founder of Fourth Political Theory.

He was resolutely anti-liberal and anti-communist but as well very critical toward national socialism. He has laid the basis for completely new political philosophy that I try to render explicit. I am convinced that we need to re-discover Heidegger , re-read his writings beyond any form of classifications. He is a kind of metaphysical prophet.

3. Inclusive Bourgeois Civic Nationalism on the Scottish Model offers a better way for dealing with social contradictions like class than ethnic nationalism which just deals with the ethnic other. Civic nationalism offers a framework in which a socialist and communist movement can move forward. Western Ukraine being prime example of self destructive ethnic nationalism.

I think the problem has two levels. First – the ethnic organic societies should be saved from nationalist modernist dictatorship of the Western kind. The Eurasianism is precisely this: traditional sacred religious and spiritual Empire based on organic traditional ethnic societies against bourgeois Nation State and globalization (that is the universalization of the liberal pattern on the world scale). Here on the first level

ethnic nationalism can be considered as legitimate part of liberation struggle against imperialism. That is the case of Welsh or Scottish fight today that I fully support.

More than this: I consider legitimate the will of Ukrainians to re-affirm their ethnic identity. But one thing affirmation of identity the other – creation of new bourgeois National State that will necessarily oppress the ethnic minorities. So National State – big or small is never solution.

Here we are coming the second level. The struggle for ethnic historic identity being legitimate it should be placed in correct context. This context should be Sacred and Imperial, not national. Russian Empire was sacred.

I think that the myth of the Sacred Empire of King Arthur can be regarded as celtic project for eschatological unification of the Western Europe. That was the idea of Henry VII that was fully inverted by Henry VIII. So I suggest Red Dragon Empire as a kind of Pan-Celtic vision of the great space that should overcome the context of small ethnic nationalism.

The past has its roots in the eternity. And eternity is always new and fresh. So I consider King Arthur and Holy Grail narrative as something ontologically real.

The English Empire was thalassocratic and merchant, the new Carthage. That was anti-Empire – modernist, capitalist and racist. It was wrong not because of being Empire but because of being anti-Empire. Against it we need to oppose not only ethnic struggle of liberation but alternative continental tellurocratic Empire. Irish, Welsh and Scottish people as well as Bretons and French people should create their proper celtic imperial vision. The figures of the King of Britons Ambigatos or King Arthur can be taken as symbols for this.

So Russian Spring as it is called is not nationalist. It is imperial and spiritual revival of sacred roots of our Eurasian – inclusive, not exclusive! – identity. We are Third Rome. It is our eschatological project. Not narrow nationalism or new kind of imperialism: pluricentric vision that refuses anglosaxon and modernist global Empire but accept plurality of imperial spaces. We don't want to exchange American domination for Russian one. We are struggling for independent great spaces – Eurasian, European, Celtic, German, North-American, South American, Muslim, Chinese, Indian, African and so on.

So first level – anticolonial struggle on the ethnic ground; the second – positive multipolar vision based on the concept of the plurality of sacred Empires (great spaces).

4. Mao's theory of knowledge based on knowing through doing (On Practice) and his theory of contradiction (On Contradiction) and Marxism Leninism Maoism offers a better route to knowledge than Heidegger's intuitive knowledge through being.

Mao was right affirming that socialism should be not exclusively proletarian but also peasant and based on the ethnic traditions. It is closer to the truth than universalist industrial internationalist version represented by trotskyism. But I think that sacred part in Maoism was missed or underdeveloped. Its links with Confucianism and Taoism were weak. Maoism is too Modern for me. For China it would be best solution to preserve the socialism and political domination of national-communist party (as today) but develop more sacred tradition – Confucianism and Taoism. It is rather significant that ideas of Heidegger are attentively explored now by hundreds of Chinese scientists. I think Fourth Political Theory could fit to contemporary China best of all.

5. Maoism is the most successful rebasing of Communism in 21st century.

What do you think of Marxism Leninism Maoism has developed by Chairman Gonzalo in Peru and Ganapathy in India and Jose Maria Sison in Philippines ?

All these struggles were synthesis of national and class struggles and are patriotic struggles.

Generally speaking I am rather on favour of such tendencies – anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist and directed toward social justice.

But I refuse their materialism, universalism and progressivism.

They could transform in something more close to Fourth Political Theory. The 4PT is based on the Dasein and Tradition. 4PT refuse the Western hegemony and Modernity.

We could collaborate with left and with right, with Maoists or with Evolians but heading always toward new vision.

Last words.

I appreciate very much the Welsh, Irish, Scottish and Breton struggle for the affirmation of the deep Celtic identity. I am admirer of Celtic culture and history. I consider this the great treasure of Indo-european heritage.

So I think that Celtic front is very important part of our common fight.

Martin Heidegger, Russia, and Political Philosophy

April 20, 2019

Author: Leonid Savin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

The works of Martin Heidegger have recently been met with heightened interest in a number of countries. While interpretations of his texts vary widely, it is interesting that Heidegger's legacy is constantly criticized by liberals across the board, regardless of where and what the object of criticism is – be it Heidegger's work as a university professor, his interest in Ancient Greek philosophy and related interpretations of antiquity, or his relationship with the political regime in Germany before and after 1945. One gets the impression that liberals intentionally strive to demonize Heidegger and his works, yet the profundity and depth of this German philosopher's thought gives them no break. Clearly, this is because Heidegger's ideas harbor a message which is relevant to the creation of a counter-liberal project that can be realized in the most diverse forms. This is the idea of Dasein applied to a political perspective. We will discuss this in more detail below, but first it is necessary to embark on a brief excursion into the history of the study of Martin Heidegger's ideas in Russia.

In the Soviet Union, Martin Heidegger's ideas were not known to the general public, primarily because the peak of his activities coincided with Nazi rule in Germany. Heidegger himself, like many ideologists of the conservative revolution in Germany, criticized many aspects of National Socialism, but in the Soviet period any philosophy that did not follow the Marxist tradition was treated as bourgeois, false, and harmful. Perhaps the only exception is the work of Vladimir Bibikhin, although his translations of Heidegger's *Being and Time* and *Time and Being* were published in Russia only after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Moreover, these translations have been repeatedly criticized for having too simplistic of an approach, incorrect terminological interpretations, linguistic mistakes, etc. Bibikhin's lecture courses on early Heidegger at Moscow State University were delivered only in 1990-1992, i.e., during late Perestroika when the horizons of what was permissible in the USSR were expanding. That being said, it bears noting that a circle of followers of Martin Heidegger's ideas had formed in the academic sphere in Moscow in the 1980's. A similar situation took shape in St. Petersburg, which later found manifestation in translation and publishing activities.

Starting in the late 1990's, other works by this German thinker began to be translated and published. The quality of translations improved considerably (and was done by different authors), and Heidegger's legacy began to be taught at different Russian universities. Heidegger's main philosophical concepts

became obligatory for students at faculties of philosophy. However, the study of philosophical ideas does not mean that students will become philosophers or appeal to certain such concepts with regards to political processes. Plato and Aristotle are studied from the school-bench early on, but who is seriously engaged in using these philosophers of Ancient Greece's ideas in discussing socio-political issues today?

Interest in the ideas of Martin Heidegger in the context of Russian politics was triggered in the early 2000's by the various articles and presentations of the Russian philosopher and geopolitician Alexander Dugin.

Later, these materials were systematized and presented in voluminous texts. In 2010, the publishing house "Academic Project" released Alexander Dugin's book, *Martin Heidegger: The Philosophy of Another Beginning*, which was logically succeeded in the following year by *Martin Heidegger: The Possibility of a Russian Philosophy*. In 2014, both works were released by the same publishing house in a single volume entitled *Martin Heidegger: The Last God*. Dugin's interpretation of Heidegger's ideas is tied to the history of Russian ideas, Orthodox Christianity, and a special path of state development including the theory of Eurasianism.

Needless to say, recounting Heidegger's philosophical doctrine in a short journal publication would be senseless. Hundreds of volumes have been published in Germany alone which include whole works, lectures, and diaries. For our scope, let us focus merely on some provisions which, in our opinion, are applicable in a political context.

Firstly, it is worth pointing out that Heidegger employed many neologisms to describe the unfolding of time and being. One such key concept is *Dasein*, which is often translated as "being-here". The French philosopher Henry Corbin translated this term as "human reality", but for the sake of genuine, complete understanding, this and many other of Heidegger's terms are best left untranslated. They should be provided in the original alongside something similar in one's native language. Other possible variations should also be considered. For example, *das Man* expresses inauthentic *Dasein* that has fallen into banality, whereas in authentic existing, *Dasein* has the property of being-towards-death – *Sein zum Tode* – which represents existential terror. Terror is counterposed to fear, which imbues the world with external things and the internal world with empty worries. Interesting to note in this regard is the fact that modern Western policies and liberalism as such are built on fear. This tendency dates back centuries and is directly connected to the formation of Western (European) philosophy.

Let us add that another one of Dasein's properties is spatiality, as space depends on Dasein, while on the other hand it is not a function of time. Dasein conditionally exists between the outer and inner, the past and present, the margin and the instant. Dasein has existential parameters – being-in-the-world (In-der-Welt-Sein), being-in (In-sein), being-with (Mit-sein), care (die Sorge), thrownness (Geworfenheit), Befindlichkeit (attunement, sofindingness, disposedness), fear (Furcht), understanding (Verstehen), discourse (Rede), and mood (Stimmung).

Another important element of Heidegger's philosophy is the fourfold encompassing Sky, Divinities, Earth, and Mortals – which are depicted in the following manner: the Sky in the upper left, the Divinities (immortals) in the upper right, mortals (people) in the bottom left, and the Earth in the lower right. An axis runs between people and gods and another between Sky and Earth. The center of the fourfold is the most authentic modus of the existence of Dasein.

It should also be noted that Heidegger distinguishes between past and that which has passed, what is present and what is now, and the future and what is forthcoming. Dasein, according to Heidegger, must make a fundamental choice between the forthcoming and the future, i.e., the choice of authentic existing and directly confronting being (Seyn). Then the forthcoming will become the future. If Dasein chooses inauthentic existence, then the forthcoming will only be forthcoming, and therefore will not come into being.

Upon describing all of these elements of Heidegger's philosophy in detail, Alexander Dugin poses a question: can one speak of a specific Russian Dasein? What are its existentials? In what does it differ from the European Dasein? Dugin arrives at the conclusion that a special Russian Dasein does exist, and not only a Russian one, for at the heart of each civilization lies a particular "thinking presence", Dasein, which determines the structure of a given civilization's Logos. As follows, every people (civilization) has its own special set of existentials.

And here we can find the political dimension of Dasein as Dugin sees it in his proposed concept of the Fourth Political Theory. Dugin focuses on three political theories claimed to be universal – Liberalism, Marxism and Fascism (National-Socialism). Each of them has their own subject of history.

Historical experience has proven that the Western liberal world has tried to forcibly impose its will upon all others. According to this idea, all public systems of the Earth are variants of the Western – liberal – system¹ and their distinctive features should disappear before the approach of the conclusion of this world epoch.²

Jean Baudrillard also states that this is not a clash of civilizations, but an almost innate resistance between one universal homogeneous culture and those who resist this globalization.³

Apart from Liberalism, two more ideologies are known for having tried to achieve world supremacy, namely: Communism (i.e. Marxism in its various aspects) and Fascism/National Socialism. As Alexander Dugin rightly notes, Fascism arose after the first two ideologies and disappeared before them. After the disintegration of the USSR, the Marxism that was born in the 19th Century has been definitely discredited as well. Liberalism, based mainly on individualism and the atomistic society, human rights and the Leviathan-State described by Hobbes, emerged because of *bellum omnium contra omnes*⁴ and has long held on.

Here it is necessary to analyze the relation of the aforesaid ideologies in the contexts of their contemporary times and the loci from which they emerged.

We know that Marxism was a somewhat futuristic idea – Marxism prophesied the future victory of Communism at a time that nonetheless remained uncertain. In this regard it is a messianic doctrine, seeing the inevitability of its victory that would usher the culmination and end of the historical process. But Marx was a false prophet and this victory never eventuated.

National Socialism and Fascism, on the contrary, tried to recreate the abundance of a mythic Golden Age, but with a modernist form⁵. Fascism and National Socialism were attempts to usher in a new cycle of time, laying the basis for a new Civilization in the aftermath of what was seen as a cultural decline and death of the Western Civilization (hence the idea of the Thousand-Year Reich). This was abortive too.

Liberalism (like Marxism) proclaimed the end of history, most cogently described by Francis Fukuyama (as “the End of History and the Last Man”)⁶. Such an end, nonetheless, never took place; and we have instead a nomadic-like “information society” composed of atomized, egoist individuals⁷ that consume avidly the fruits of techno-culture. Moreover, tremendous economic collapses are taking place worldwide; violent conflicts occur (numerous local revolts, but also long-term wars on an international scale); and disappointment dominates our world rather than the universal utopia promised in the name of “progress.”⁸

From such an historical perspective, it is possible to understand the links between the emergence of an ideology within a particular historical epoch, or what has been called the *zeitgeist* or “spirit of the age.”

Fascism and National Socialism saw the foundations of history in the state (Fascism) or race (Hitlerian National socialism). For Marxism it was the working class and economic relations between classes. Liberalism on the other hand, sees history in terms of the atomized individual detached from the complex of cultural heritage and inter-social contact and communication. However, nobody has hitherto considered as the subject of history the People as Being, with all the richness of intercultural links, traditions, ethnic features and worldview.

If we consider various alternatives, even nominally ‘socialist’ countries have adopted liberal mechanisms and patterns that have exposed regions with a traditional way of life to accelerated transformation, deterioration and outright obliteration. The destruction of the peasantry, religion and family bonds by Marxism were manifestations of this disruption of traditional organic societies, whether in Maoist China or the USSR under Lenin and Trotsky.

This fundamental opposition to tradition embodied in both Liberalism and Marxism can be understood by the method of historical analysis considered above: Marxism and Liberalism both emerged from the same *zeitgeist* in the instance of these doctrines, from the spirit of money.⁹

Several attempts to create alternatives to neo-Liberalism are now visible – such as the political Shia in Iran, where the main state goal is the acceleration of the arrival of the Mahdi and the revision of socialism in Latin America (reforms in Bolivia are especially indicative). These anti-Liberal responses, nonetheless, are limited within the borders of their relevant, single statehood.

Ancient Greece is the source of all three theories of political philosophy. It is important to understand that at the beginning of philosophical thought, the Greeks considered the primary question of Being. However, they risked obfuscation by the nuances of the most complicated relation between being and thinking, between pure being (*Seyn*) and its expression in existence (*Seiende*), between human being (*Dasein*) and being in itself (*Sein*).¹⁰

It is noteworthy that three waves of globalization have been the corollaries of the aforementioned three political theories (Marxism, Fascism, and Liberalism). As a result, we need after them a new political theory which will generate a Fourth Wave: the re-establishment of (every) People with its eternal

values. In other words, Dasein will be the subject of history. Every People has its very own Dasein. And, of course, after necessary philosophical considerations, political action must proceed.

Let us continue the preceding discussion about Heidegger's ideas in Russia in the context of politics. It is significant that in Russia in 2016, Heidegger's notebooks, *Ponderings II-VI*, known as his "Black Notebooks 1931-1938", were published by the Gaidar Institute – a liberal organization which Russian conservative circles consider to be a network of agents of Western influence. Yegor Gaidar was the author of the liberal economic reforms in Russia under President Yeltsin and held the post of Minister of Finance in 1992. Gaidar was also acting Prime Minister of the Russian Federation and acting Minister of Economics in 1993-1994. Due to his reforms, the country was subject to inflation, privatization, and many sectors of the economy were ruined. The latter work of Heidegger's is considered his most politicized, in which he speaks not only of philosophical categories, but of the role of the Germans in history, upbringing and education, as well as the political project of National Socialism. The Gaidar Institute most likely intended to discredit Heidegger's teachings with such, but the opposite has happened, as the publication of Heidegger's diaries has been met with widespread interest.

Paradoxically, in this work Heidegger criticizes Liberalism in the following manner: "The 'liberal' sees 'connectedness' in his own way. He sees only 'dependencies' – 'influences', but he never understands that there can be an influencing which is of service to the genuine basic stream of all flowing and provides a path and a direction."¹¹ Let us present a few more quotations from this work which, in our opinion, are of interest with regards to our approach.

"The metaphysics of Dasein must become deeper in accord with the innermost structure of that metaphysics and must expand into the metapolitics 'of' the historical people."¹²

"The worthiness for power out of the greatness of Dasein – and Dasein out of the truth of its mission."¹³

"Education — the effective and binding realization of the power of the state, taking that power as the will of a people to itself."¹⁴

"At issue is a leap into specifically historical Da-sein. This leap can be carried out only as the liberation of what is given as endowment into what is given as task."¹⁵

As Dugin has pointed out, if early Heidegger assumed that Dasein is something given, then later Heidegger concluded that Dasein is something that must be discovered, substantiated, and constituted. To this end, it is necessary first and foremost to accomplish a serious intellectual process (see Heidegger's *What is Called Thinking*).

It is crucial to understand that although Heidegger's ideas are considered to be a kind of culmination of European philosophy (which began with the Ancient Greeks, a point which is symbolic in itself since Heidegger built his hypotheses on an analysis of Ancient Greek philosophers), Heidegger is also often classified as a thinker who transcended Eurocentrism. For this reason, still during his lifetime, many of Heidegger's concepts were welcomed in regions that had developed critiques of philosophy with regards to the European heritage as a whole. For example, enormous interest in Heidegger's works could be found in 20th century Latin America. In Brazil, Heidegger's works were addressed by Vicente Ferreira da Silva, in Argentina by Carlos Astrada, Vicente Fantone, Enrique Dussel, and Francisco Romero, in Venezuela by Juan David García Bacca, and in Colombia by Ruben Sierra Mejía. Additional confirmation of this can be found in the words of the Iranian philosopher Ahmad Fardid to the effect that Heidegger can be seen as a figure of global significance, not merely as a representative of European thought. Given that Fardid, who is known for his concept of *Gharbzadegi*, or "Westoxification", was a consistent critic of Western thought, which he believed contributed to the emergence of nihilism, such recognition of Heidegger is rather telling.

Indeed, Heidegger has had followers not only in Iran, but in many Asian countries as well. In Japan in the 1930's, Heidegger's student Kitaro Nishida founded the Kyoto School of Philosophy. Although in Japan Heidegger was largely considered a bearer of the European spirit (following the Meiji reforms, Japan was swept with excessive enthusiasm for everything European, especially German culture and philosophy), it is interesting to note that Heidegger's notion of "existence" was redrafted in a Buddhist spirit as "true being" (*genjitsu sonzai*) and "Nothing" ("Oblivion") was interpreted as "emptiness" (*shunya*). In other words, the Japanese interpreted Martin Heidegger's basic concepts in accordance with their own concepts and often blended his terms with the concepts of such European existentialists as Jean-Paul Sartre, Albert Camus, and Gabriel Marcel. Another Japanese philosopher, Keiji Nishitani, has adapted Heidegger's ideas to traditional Eastern models, as is so often done in the East. Parallels between traditional Eastern philosophy and Heideggerian analysis have also been drawn in Korea by Hwa Yol Jung.

In this regard, Russia and the study of Martin Heidegger's legacy form a kind of bridge between Europe and the East, between the rigid rationalism that has subsumed European consciousness since the Middle Ages, and the abstract contemplative thinking characteristic of Asian peoples. Let us say even more

directly that Eurasianism and Heideggerianism are in some sense interconnected and spiritually close tendencies among contemporary ideological currents in Russia.

Although these two schools can also be examined as independent philosophical doctrines, as is often done by secular scholars and opportunistic political scientists, any deep understanding of one can be had only upon grasping the other.

Footnotes:

1 For example, the insistence that all states and peoples should adopt the Westminster English parliamentary system as a universal model regardless of ancient traditions, social structures and hierarchies.

2 « Les droits de l'homme et le nouvel occidentalisme » in L'Homme et la société (numéro spécial [1987], p.9

3 Jean Baudrillard, *Power Inferno*, Paris: Galilée, 2002. Also see for example Jean Baudrillard, "The Violence of the Global" (< <http://www.ctheory.net/articles.aspx?id=385>>).

4 In English: War of all against all.

5 Hence the criticism of National Socialism and Fascism by Right-Traditionalists such as Julius Evola. See K R Bolton, *Thinkers of the Right* (Luton, 2003), p. 173..

6 Francis Fukuyama *The End of History and the Last Man*, Penguin Books, 1992.

7 G Pascal Zachary, *The Global Me*, NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 2000.

8 Clive Hamilton, *Affluenza: When Too Much is Never Enough*, NSW, Australia: Allen and Unwin, 2005.

9 This is the meaning of Spengler's statement that, "Herein lies the secret of why all radical (i.e. poor) parties necessarily become the tools of the money-powers, the Equites, the Bourse. Theoretically their enemy is capital, but practically they attack, not the Bourse, but Tradition on behalf of the Bourse. This is as true today as it was for the Gracchuan age, and in all countries..." Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*, (London : George Allen & Unwin , 1971), Vol. 2, p. 464.

10 See Martin Heidegger on these terms.

11 Martin Heidegger, *Ponderings II-VI: Black Notebooks 1931-1938* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 2016), 28.

12 Ibid, 91.

13 Ibid, 83.

14 Ibid, 89.

15 Ibid, 173.

Modern Populism

March 17, 2017

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Dugin's Guideline –

As of late, European intellectuals are discussing a new political concept that is becoming increasingly relevant: the populist moment.

They are worried by left-wing Schmittians in the likes of Chantal Mouffe on the one hand and, on the other, the brilliant ideologist of European conservatives and the “New Right,” the most formidable and influential figure in intellectual Europe, the philosopher Alain de Benoist. Both right and left are publishing texts dedicated to the populist moment, each offering different interpretations, arguments, and predictions for the future.

What is the populist moment?

First of all, it is the emergence in politics of leaders who become extremely popular by appealing to the broad masses while not concerning themselves with the ideological coherence of their platforms and positions. These are first and foremost Putin and Trump, whose views are difficult to qualify in conventional categories of right, left, etc. Such leaders understand and feel society, what it genuinely wants, what it is striving for, what it thinks, what it fears, and they answer these expectations directly without bothering to couch such in some kind of system. And this is working better and better. Whether by accident or system failure, this is gradually becoming a trend. After Trump, this is already a global reality that cannot be ignored.

Secondly, liberal democracy is in blatant, complete crisis. Wherever it tries to act openly and directly insist on its ideological values – human rights, gender politics, cosmopolitanism, the open society, globalization, etc. – its representatives consistently suffer failure. Liberalism still controls many spheres

such as global finance, the global corporate media, culture, education, and technology, but in society it is already essentially rejected. The end of history did not happen and Fukuyama himself, like a complete loser, is now muttering about how the United States is, you see, a failed state. Liberalism is dead. But it is not its old enemies, Communism and Fascism, that destroyed it, but something new. Populism. Any populist, whether right or left, can now beat any liberal.

Thirdly – and this is already becoming more serious – a new subject, a new phenomenon is emerging in the forefront of politics: the people, or *populus*, hence “populism”. The people is absent in the ideologies of modernity. There is no people in liberalism, whose main subject is the individual. There is no people in communism, where class is the most important. Nor is there the people in fascism, since the emphasis is on the state. All of this remains in the 20th century. Now from around the corner is being mobilized something forgotten or altogether never considered: the People. This is not simply the sum of individuals, classes, or citizens with passports and residence permits. It is something living, organic, whole, ever-changing, and avoiding strict definitions. The people lives longer than people. It has different cycles and different scales. It trusts in myth and is skeptical of science. Even if the people is cowardly, it is admired by fearless heroes. Even if it is crooked, it sincerely loves beauty. And now this People is coming into active contradiction with the existing political system.

The people is neither left nor right. The people stands all at once for order and for freedom, for a powerful state and for social justice, for strength and for continuous holiday. The people easily unites opposites without even noticing. The people lives according to a particular logic that has nothing to do with the norms of modern political science or sociology. The people is always not what others think about it. It does not lend itself to be calculated or counted. It proceeds from a different logic than that of the Enlightenment and societies of modernity. In some sense, the people is very ancient. It is nurtured by the juices of eternity.

The people as a political concept is appearing today in opposition to liberalism. The liberals are hollering about a fascist or communist-fascist threat, and they are incapable of understanding the essence of the populist moment, which they interpret through old clichés. Hence why they are losing. Hence why they are doomed.

And yet both left and right are unanimous in thinking that this is only a moment, a limited period of time, a kind of quantum in historical movement. Probably no one can say whether the People and consequently populism is a system, program, strategy, or merely a temporary correction on the path of liberal globalization. The globalists had their moment in the early '90's – the unipolar moment. They ruined everything they could over thirty years, turning globalization and the unipolar world into a

hideous caricature. The reformers in Russia in the '90's did the same with democracy. Now a different moment is arriving. The people is appearing on the stage of world history. This is a chance, a risk, a responsibility, and a challenge. But it is our moment. Not utilizing it would be a real crime.

Yes, that's right, not taking advantage of such a populist moment would be foolish and even criminal. But is there such a crime that we have not yet committed? Alas, everything rests on our shoulders. Nevertheless, this is a wonderful, open opportunity for a true alternative, a Russian alternative.

Modernization without Westernization

October 12, 2016

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 7 from The Russian Thing Vol. 1 (Arktogeya, Moscow: 2001)

The Third Position

In Samuel Huntington's famous article describing the impending "clash of civilizations", Huntington mentions a very important formula: "modernization without Westernization." This formula describes the relationship to problems of socio-economic and technological development experienced by some countries (as a rule, those of the Third World) who, while understanding the objective necessity of the development and improvement of their social systems' political and economic mechanisms, refuse to blindly follow the West, instead striving to put some of Western technology – in isolation from its ideological content – in service of their traditional value systems and national, religious, and political characters. Many representatives of the elites of the East, having received higher Western educations, return to their home countries with important technical knowledge and methodologies which they then use to strengthen their own national systems. Thus, instead of the rapprochement between civilizations expected by liberal optimists, what ensues is the arming of certain "archaic," "traditionalist" regimes with new technologies which render civilizational confrontation all the sharper.

To this insightful analysis can be added the consideration that the majority of outstanding "Westernized" intellectuals, cultural figures, and creative individuals were and are largely nonconformists, anti-system oriented people "of the East" who in studying the geniuses of the West strengthen their own critical positions. A characteristic example of such a path is that of Ali Shariati, the main theoretician of the Iranian Revolution. Shariati studied in Paris, mastered Heidegger and Guenon as well as several neo-Marxist authors, and gradually came to the conviction that a conservative-revolutionary synthesis between revolutionary Shiism, mystical Islam, socialism, and existentialism was needed. Shariati was then able to bring the Iranian intellectual elite and youth to revolution who otherwise would have hardly recognized their ideals in the gloomy traditionalism of the Mullahs. This example is especially important since we are dealing with a successful revolution which ended in the complete victory of an anti-mondialist, anti-Western, and conservative-revolutionary regime.

The same path was walked by the Russian Slavophiles who borrowed various models from German philosophers (Herder, Fichte, Hegel) which would come to form the basis of their purely Russian national conviction. Such is also the method of the contemporary Russian Neo-Eurasianists who are creatively processing the non-conformist doctrines of the European "New Right" and "New Left" in the interests of Russia.

The Autarchy of Large Spaces

Fleshing out the concepts of "modernization" and "Westernization" itself is of tremendous value. After all, the West is doing everything that it can so that both terms are rendered synonymous in mass consciousness. According to this logic, it turns out that change and reform are possible only if they are oriented towards the West and copy Western models. The alternative is presented as "stagnation," "archaism," "conservatism," inefficiency, and a lack of dynamism. Thus, the West achieves its civilizational goal by imposing the limits, laws, and criteria mastered by it on the rest of the world. This partiality and egoism of liberalism in relation to those for whom liberalism is promoted as a "progressive alternative" was brilliantly described by the genius theoretician of economics, Friedrich List. In his works, List showed that countries having long-since gone along the path of market economics and liberalism invariably benefit from the imposition of a similar model on those countries using alternative models. As can be seen, the "equal" terms of "free trade" in fact lead to the further enrichment of the developed market countries, and to the impoverishment of those which have attempted to follow the market path. The rich, in this case, get richer while the poor get poorer. Accordingly, List asserts, traditionally liberal countries (and primarily the Anglo-Saxon ones) excessively benefit from imposing their own model on everyone else, as this guarantees their obtainment of colossal economic and political profit.

But what is the way out for such non-liberal countries which, due to objective circumstances, are confronted with effective and aggressive liberal competitors? This problem was especially acute for Germany in the 19th century, that very country which Friedrich List was called to aid. His answer was the theory of the "autarchy of large spaces" which is an economic synonym for "modernization without Westernization." It should be noted that List's ideas were employed by such different politicians as Walther Rathenau, Count Witte, and Vladimir Lenin with enormous success.

The concept of the "autarchy of large spaces" implies that non-market states left in the conditions of harsh competition with market ones should work out a model of autonomous development which partly reproduces the technological developments of liberal systems in the severely restrictive framework of a large-scale "customs union." In this case, "freedom of trade" is limited to the framework of a strategic

bloc of states integrating their political and economic-administrative efforts in order to rapidly increase economic dynamics. In relation to the more developed liberal countries, by contrast, a protective customs barrier is raised based on the principles of strict protectionism. Thus, the scope for expanding the newest economic technologies is maximally widened while, on the other hand, this is supported by consistent political and economic sovereignty.

Undoubtedly, such an approach extremely discomforts the liberals of developed market states as it exposes their strategy, reveals their aggressive undertones, and effectively counteracts their geopolitical interference and, ultimately, their external control over those states which the liberals seek to transform into economic and political colonies.

Modernization and Sovereignty

Let us note that the thesis of “modernization without Westernization” is itself a conceptual weapon, the rise of which is extremely uncomfortable for the representatives of the West. For the West, what is most important is instilling a dualistic scheme in the public consciousness in which reformists and the supporters of change stand on the one hand against conservatives, the stubborn supporters of the past, on the other. As long as this equation is presented in such a way, then definite support is assured for the “Westernizing reformers.” But all that is necessary is to introduce a third element into this formula, and the picture becomes much more interesting. Besides the “Westernizing modernists” and “anti-Western anti-modernists,” whose confrontation always leads sooner or later to the victory of the “reformers” supposedly embodying the “future,” there appear the “anti-Western modernists” or “conservative revolutionaries.” The very fact of such a force as an independent platform, ideological bloc, economic model, and cultural front sharply aggravates the proportions of otherwise banal political confrontation. The “anti-Western modernists” stand for radical reforms, revolutionary changes to economic models, the explosive rotation of elites in vital spheres of governance, and the large-scale modernization of all spheres of life. But, on this note, the complete preservation of geopolitical, economic, and cultural sovereignty, the return to one’s roots, and support for identity remain an absolute and nonnegotiable condition. For them, both conditions – “modernization” and “sovereignty” – remain absolute imperatives which are not to be compromised under any circumstances.

In fact, even in the modern world we see various civilizational pockets in which individual peoples and countries continue to insist on preserving their identity despite all considerations of political expediency or economic efficiency. Serbia, Iraq, Iran, Sudan, North Korea, Libya, and Cuba are examples of such. Possessing insufficient conditions for compete autarchy, however, these regimes bear the costs of enormous sacrifices to defend their identity, opt for direct and extremely “costly” confrontation with

the West by rejecting its diktat. The drawbacks of withholding autonomy could be easily overcome in the case of such an enormous formation as Russia, together with some friendly CIS countries and certain states of the “far abroad.”

The question lies only in political will and determination. The guaranteeing of resources is secondary in this case. Let us refer to the following example: in Republika Srpska in Bosnia, when I asked what was preventing the reaching of a truce in a specific area, I received an astonishing response from a volunteer militiaman: “That there mountain, that little mountain, is famous in Serbian chronicles from the Middle Ages. Now she is in the hands of the enemies. There’s nothing on it – no strategic points, no useful minerals, no industrial enterprises – it’s just a piece of land. But a piece of Serbian land. We’ve already buried several hundred of our fighters there. We’ve been offered peace in exchange for that damned mountain. But we won’t accept such a peace. We need that mountain. That useless mountain...”

The very fact of national history and the span of national territory are fully comparable to the most serious utilitarian, technological, and economic parameters. Moreover, for most nations, such are worth even more – life.

The Conservative Revolution – the last imperative

“Modernization without Westernization” should become the main slogan of a “new course” which should unite the best forces from both the “conservative” and “reformist” camps. This new platform, if carefully developed and rigorously implanted in the consciousness of the masses, could instantly clear up a number of dark spots in our political and economic lives. Together with this, the subversive nature of the activities of those forces which either deny the necessity of reforms (the apologists of nostalgia and stagnation) or deny the necessity of submitting reforms to the national, geopolitical, civilizational, and cultural imperative (the agents of Western influence) will become obvious. Accordingly, in our critical situation, both of these groups should be kicked out of the political establishment and the central ideological, economic, and conceptual initiative should be delegated to the newly established front of “conservative revolutionaries.”

Multipolarity – The Definition and the Differentiation Between its Meanings

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Multipolarity – The Definition and the Differentiation Between its Meanings

From a purely scientific point of view, there still exists no full and complete theory of a multipolar world (TMW) to date, nor can it be found among the classical theories and paradigms of International Relations (IR). We will try to look for it in the latest post-positivist theories in vain. It is not fully developed in its final aspect, the sphere of geopolitical research. Time and time again this theme is openly comprehended, but still left “behind the scenes” or treated in too biased of a fashion within international relations.

Nevertheless, more and more works on foreign affairs, world politics, geopolitics, and actually, international politics, are dedicated to the theme of multipolarity. A growing number of authors try to understand and describe multipolarity as a model, phenomenon, precedent, or possibility.

The topic of multipolarity was in one way or another touched upon in the works of the IR specialist David Kampf (in the article “The emergence of a multipolar world”), historian Paul Kennedy of Yale University (in his book “The Rise and Fall of Great Powers”), geopolitician Dale Walton (in the book “Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the XXI century: Multipolarity and the Revolution in strategic perspective”), American political scientist Dilip Hiro (in the book “After Empire: Birth of a multipolar world”), and others. The closest in understanding the sense of multipolarity, in our view, was British IR specialists Fabio Petito, who tried to build a serious and substantiated alternative to the unipolar world on the basis of the legal and philosophical concepts of Carl Schmitt.

The “multipolar world order” is also repeatedly mentioned in the speeches and writings of political figures and influential journalists. It was thus that former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, who first called the United States the “indispensable nation”, stated on February 2, 2000, that the US does not want to “establish and enforce” a unipolar world, and that economic integration has already created “a certain world that can be even called multipolar” . On January 26, 2007, in the editorial column of “The New York Times”, it was openly written that the “emergence of the multipolar world”, along with China, “now takes place at the table in parallel with other power centers such as Brussels or Tokyo”. On November 20, 2008, in the report “Global Trends 2025” by the National Intelligence Council of the U.S.,

it was indicated that the emergence of a "global multipolar system" should be expected within two decades.

Since 2009, U.S. President Barack Obama was viewed by many as the harbinger of an "era of multipolarity," believing that he would orient U.S. foreign policy priority to rising powers such as Brazil, China, India, and Russia. On July 22, 2009, Vice President Joseph Biden, during his visit to Ukraine, said: "We're trying to build a multipolar world".

And yet, all these books, articles, and statements do not contain any precise definition of what the multipolar world is (MW), nor, moreover, a coherent and consistent theory of its construction (TMW). The most common treatment for "multipolarity" means only an indication that in the current process of globalization, the undisputed center and core of the modern world (the U.S., Europe, and the wider "global West") is faced with certain new competitors - thriving or simply powerful regional powers and power blocs belonging to the "second" world. A comparison of the potentials of the U.S. and Europe on the one hand, and of new rising powers (China, India, Russia, Latin America, etc.) on the other hand, convinces one more and more of the relative traditional superiority of the West and raises new questions about the logic of further processes that determine the global architecture of forces on a planetary scale – in politics, economics, energy, demography, culture, etc.

All of these comments and observations are critical for building the Theory of the Multipolar World, but by no means piece out its absence. They should be taken into account when constructing such a theory, but it is worth noting that they are fragmentary and patchy in nature, not even rising to the level of primary theoretical conceptual generalizations.

But, despite this, the reference to the multipolar world order is increasingly heard in official summits and international conferences and congresses. Links to multipolarity are present in a number of important inter-governmental agreements and in the texts of national security and defense strategy concepts of a number of influential and powerful countries (China, Russia, Iran, and partly the EU). Therefore, today more than ever, it is important to take a step towards the start of a full-fledged development of the Theory of the Multipolar World, in accordance with the basic requirements of academic scholarship.

Multipolarity does not coincide with the national model of world organization according to the logic of the Westphalian system

Before closely proceeding to the construction of the Theory of the Multipolar World (TMW), we should strictly distinguish the investigated conceptual area. For this, we must consider the basic concepts and define those forms of the global world order which are certainly not multipolar and which, accordingly, multipolarity is presented as an alternative.

Let's start with the Westphalian system, which recognizes the absolute sovereignty of the nation-state and constructs the legal field of International Relations on this basis. This system, developed after 1648 (the end of the Thirty Years' War in Europe), has passed through several stages of its development, and to some extent continued to reflect objective reality until the end of World War II. It was born out of rejecting the claims of the medieval empires to universalism and the "divine mission", and it corresponded with the bourgeois reforms in European societies. It was also based on the assumption that only a nation-state can possess the highest sovereignty, and that outside of it, there is no other entity that would have the legal right to interfere in the internal policy of this state – regardless of which goals and missions (religious, political, or otherwise) guide it. From the middle of the XVII century to the middle of the XX century, this principle predetermined European policy and, accordingly, was transferred to other countries of the world with certain amendments.

The Westphalian system was originally relevant only for European powers, and their colonies were regarded merely as their continuation, not possessing sufficient political and economic potential to pretend to be an independent entity. Since the beginning of the XX century, the same principle was extended to the former colonies during the process of decolonization.

This Westphalian model assumes full legal equality between all sovereign states. In this model, there are as many poles of foreign policy decisions in the world as there are sovereign states. By default of inertia, this rule is still in force, and all of international law is based on it.

In practice, of course, there is inequality and hierarchical subordination between various sovereign states. In the First and Second World Wars, the distribution of power among the largest world powers led to a confrontation between separate blocs, where decisions were made in the country that was the most powerful among its allies.

As a result of World War II, owing to the defeat of Nazi Germany and the Axis Powers, the bipolar scheme of international relations (the Yalta bipolar system) developed in the global system.

International law continued to de-jure recognize the absolute sovereignty of any nation-state, but de-facto, basic decisions regarding the central issues of the world order and global policy were made only in two centers - in Washington and in Moscow.

The multipolar world differs from the classical Westphalian system by the fact that it does not recognize the separate nation-state, legally and formally sovereign, to have the status of a full-fledged pole. This means that the number of poles in a multipolar world should be substantially less than the number of recognized (and therefore, unrecognized) nation-states. The vast majority of these states are not able today to provide for their own security or prosperity in the face of a theoretically possible conflict with the current hegemon (the U.S.). Therefore, they are politically and economically dependent on an external authority. Being dependent, they cannot be the centers of a truly independent and sovereign will concerning the global issues of the world order.

Multipolarity is not a system of international relations that insists upon the legal equality of nation-states as the actual, factual state of affairs. This is only a facade of a very different picture of the world based on a real, rather than nominal, balance of forces and strategic capabilities.

Multipolarity operates not with the situation as it exists de-jure, but rather de-facto, and it proceeds from the statement of the fundamental inequality between nation-states in the modern and empirically fixable model of the world. Moreover, the structure of this inequality is that the secondary and tertiary powers are not able to defend their sovereignty, in any transient bloc configuration, in the face of possible external challenge by the hegemonic power. This means that sovereignty is a legal fiction today.

Multipolarity is not Bipolarity

After the Second World War, the Yalta bipolar system was developed. It continued to formally insist upon the recognition of the absolute sovereignty of all states, the principle on which the UN was organized, and carried on the work of the League of Nations. However, in practice, two centers of global decision-making appeared in the world – the U.S. and the USSR. The U.S. and the USSR were two alternative political-economic systems, respectively global capitalism and global socialism. It thus was that strategic bipolarity was founded on ideological and philosophical dualism – liberalism against Marxism.

The bipolar world was based on the symmetric comparability of the economic and military-strategic parity potential of the American and Soviet warring camps. At the same time, no other country affiliated with a particular camp remotely had the cumulative power to compare to that of Moscow or Washington. Consequently, there were two hegemonies on the global scale, each surrounded by a constellation of allied (half-vassal, in a strategic sense) countries. In this model, formally recognized national sovereignty gradually lost its weight. First of all, countries associated with either hegemon were dependent on that pole's policies. Therefore, the said country was not independent, and regional conflicts (generally developed in areas of the Third World) quickly escalated into a confrontation of two superpowers seeking to redistribute the balance of planetary influence on the "disputed territories". This explains the conflicts in Korea, Vietnam, Angola, Afghanistan, etc.

In the bipolar world, there was also the third force – the Non-Aligned Movement. It consisted of some Third World countries that refused to make an unequivocal choice in favor of either capitalism or socialism, and that instead preferred to maneuver between the global antagonistic interests of the U.S. and the USSR. To some extent, a few succeeded, but the possibility of non-alignment itself assumed the existence of two poles, which in a varying degree balanced each other. Moreover, these "non-aligned countries" were in no way able to create a "third pole" owing to the main parameters of the superpowers, the fragmented and unconsolidated nature of the Non-Aligned Movement members, and the lack of any joint general socio-economic platform. The world was divided into the capitalist West (the first world), the socialist East (the second world), and "the rest" (the Third World). Besides, "all the others" in every sense represented the world periphery where the interests of the superpowers occasionally appeared. Between the superpowers themselves, the probability of conflict was all but ruled out due to parity (specifically in the guarantee of mutual assured nuclear destruction). This made it so that the preferred areas for the partial revision of the balance of power were the periphery countries (Asia, Africa, Latin America).

After the collapse of one of the two poles (the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991), the bipolar system also collapsed. This has created the preconditions for the emergence of an alternative world order. Many analysts and experts in IR rightly talked about "the end of the Yalta system". While de-jure recognizing sovereignty, the Yalta Peace was de-facto built upon the principle of the balance of the two symmetric and relatively equal hegemonies. With the departure of one of the hegemonies from the historical scene, the whole system ceased to exist. The time of a unipolar world order or "unipolar moment" arrived.

A multipolar world is not bipolar world (such as we knew it in the second half of the twentieth century), because in today's world, there is no power that can single-handedly resist the strategic power of the United States and the countries of NATO, and moreover, there is no generalizing and coherent ideology capable of uniting a large part of humanity in a hard ideological opposition to the ideology of liberal democracy, capitalism, and "human rights", on which the United States now bases a new sole

hegemony. Neither modern Russia, China, India, or some other state can pretend to be a second pole under these conditions. The recovery of bipolarity is impossible due to ideological (the end of the popular appeal of Marxism) and military-technical reasons. As for the latter, the U.S and NATO countries took the lead so much over the past 30 years that symmetric competition with them in the military-strategic, economic, and technical spheres is not possible for any single country.

Multipolarity is Not Compatible With a Unipolar World

The collapse of the Soviet Union meant the disappearance of both a symmetrical and powerful superpower, as well as a giant ideological camp. It was the end of one of the two global hegemonies. The entire structure of the world order from this point is irreversibly and qualitatively different. Herewith the remaining pole - led by the United States and on the basis of liberal-democratic capitalist ideology - is preserved as a phenomenon and has continued to expand its socio-political system (democracy, the market, the ideology of "human rights") on a global scale. Precisely, this is called a unipolar world or the unipolar world order. In such a world, there is a single center of decision making on major global issues. The West and its core, the Euro-Atlantic community, led by the United States, found themselves in the role of the only remaining available hegemony. The entire space of the planet in such an environment is a triple regionalization (described in detail by the Neo-Marxist theory of E.Wallerstein):

- - Core zone ("rich North", "center"),
- - Area of the world periphery ("poor South", "periphery"),
- - Transitional zone ("semi-periphery", including major countries, actively developing towards capitalism: China, India, Brazil, some countries in the Pacific, as well as Russia, by inertia preserving significant strategic, economic, and energy potential).

The unipolar world seemed to finally be an established reality in the 1990s, and some U.S. analysts have declared on this basis the thesis of the "end of history" (Fukuyama). This thesis meant that the world will become totally ideologically, politically, economically and socially homogenous, and that now all of the processes occurring in it will no longer be a historical drama based on the battle of ideas and interests, but rather an economic (and relatively peaceful) competition of market participants - similar to how the internal policy of the free democratic liberal regimes is constructed. In this understanding, democracy becomes global and the planet is composed only of the West and its periphery (i.e. the countries which will gradually integrate into it).

The most precise design of the theory of unipolarity was proposed by American neoconservatives, who emphasized the U.S.' role in the new global world order. They sometimes proclaimed the United States as the "New Empire" (R.Kaplan) or the "benevolent global hegemony" (U.Kristol, R.Keygan), anticipating the offensive of the "American Century" (The Project for the New American Century). In the neocon view, unipolarity has acquired a theoretical foundation. The future world order was seen as a US-centric construction, where the core is the U.S. as a global arbiter and embodiment of the principles of "freedom and democracy", and a constellation of other countries is structured around this center, reproducing the American model with varying degrees of accuracy. They vary in geography and in their degree of similarity to the United States:

- - First, the inner circle – countries of Europe and Japan,
- - Secondly, the thriving liberal countries of Asia,
- - Finally, all the rest.

All the zones located around the "Global America", regardless of their political orbit, are included in the process of "democratization" and "Americanization." The spread of American values goes in parallel with the implementation of practical American interests and the expansion of the zone of direct American control on a global scale.

At the strategic level, unipolarity is expressed in the central U.S. role in NATO, and further, in the asymmetric superiority of the combined military capabilities of NATO countries over all the other nations of the world.

Parallel to this, the West is superior to other non-Western countries in its economic potential, level of development of high technology, etc. Most importantly: the West is the matrix where the established system of values and norms which are currently regarded as the universal standard for all other countries in the world was historically formed. This can be called the global intellectual hegemony which, on the one hand, maintains the technical infrastructure for global control, and on the other, stands in the center of the dominant planetary paradigm. Material hegemony goes hand in hand with the spiritual, intellectual, cognitive, cultural, and information hegemonies.

In principle, the American political elite is guided precisely by this consciously perceived hegemonic approach, however, it is clearly and transparently spoken about by the neocons, while representatives of other different political and ideological directions prefer more streamlined expressions and euphemisms. Even critics of the unipolar world in the United States do not challenge the principle of the

"universality" of American values and the desire for their approval at the global level. Objections are focused around what extent this project is realistic in the medium and long term, and whether the U.S. is able to bear the burden of the global world empire alone.

Challenges to such direct and open American dominance, which seemed to be a fait accompli in the 1990s, led some American analysts (specifically Charles Krauthammer, who introduced this concept) to posit about the end of the "unipolar moment".

But, in spite of everything, it is exactly unipolarity in one or another manifestation – overt or covert, the model of the world order – that became a reality after 1991 and remains so to this day.

In practice, unipolarity stands side by side with the nominal saving of the Westphalian system, which still contains the inertial remains of the bipolar world. The sovereignty of all nation-states is still acknowledged de-jure, and the UN Security Council still partially reflects the power balance corresponding to the realities of the "Cold War". Thus, the American unipolar hegemony is de-facto present, along with a number of international institutions that express the balance of other eras and cycles in the history of international relations. The world is constantly reminded of the contradictions between the de-jure and de-facto situation, especially when the U.S. or a Western coalition directly intervenes in the affairs of sovereign states (sometimes even bypassing the veto of such institutions as the UN Security Council). In cases such as the American invasion of Iraq in 2003, we see an example of a unilateral violation of the principle of state sovereignty (ignoring the Westphalian model), the refusal to take into account the position of Russia (Vladimir Putin) in the UN Security Council, and the loud objections of Washington's NATO partners (France's Jacques Chirac and Germany's Gerhard Schroeder).

The most consistent supporters of unipolarity (for example, Republican John McCain) insist on the enforcement of international order in line with the real balance of forces. They offer the creation of a rather different model than the UN, the "League of Democracies", in which the dominant U.S. position, that is, unipolarity, would have been legislated. The legalization of a unipolar world and the hegemonic status of the "American Empire" in the post-Yalta international relations structure is one of the possible directions of the evolution of the global political system.

It is absolutely clear that a multipolar world order not only differs from the unipolar, but is its direct antithesis. Unipolarity assumes one hegemon and one center of decision-making, while multipolarity insists on a few centers, herewith none of them having exclusive rights and thus having to take into account the positions of others. Multipolarity, therefore, is a direct logical alternative to unipolarity.

There can be no compromise between them: under the laws of logic, the world is either unipolar or multipolar. Thenceforth, it is not important how such a particular model is legally formulated, but how it is de-facto created. In the era of the "Cold War", diplomats and politicians reluctantly recognized the "bipolarity" that was an obvious fact. Therefore, it is necessary to separate the diplomatic language from concrete reality. The unipolar world is the factual world order to date. One can only argue about whether it is good or bad, whether it is the dawn of the system or, alternatively, the sunset, and whether it will last a long time or, on the contrary, quickly end. Regardless, the fact remains fact. We live in a unipolar world, and the unipolar moment still lasts (though some analysts are convinced that it is coming to an end).

The Multipolar World is Not A Nonpolar World

American critics of rigid unipolarity, and especially the ideological rivals of neo-conservatives concentrated in the "Council on Foreign Relations", offered another term instead of unipolarity - nonpolarity. This concept is based on the suggestion that the processes of globalization will continue to unfold, and the Western model of the world order will expand its presence to all the countries and peoples of the earth. Thus, the intellectual hegemony and hegemony of values of the West will continue. The global world will be the world of liberalism, democracy, free markets, and human rights, but the U.S. role as a national power and the flagship of globalization, according to proponents of this theory, will shrink. Instead of a direct American hegemony, a model of "world government" will emerge. This will be attended to by representatives of different countries, standing together with common values and striving to establish a unified socio-political and economic space in the whole world. Here again, we are dealing with an analog of Fukuyama's "end of history" described in different terms.

The nonpolar world will be based on co-operation between democratic (by default) countries, but gradually the process of formation should also include non-state actors - NGOs, social movements, separate citizen groups, network communities, etc.

The main characteristic in the construction of the nonpolar world is the dissipation of decision-making from one entity (now Washington) to the many entities of the lower level - right down to online planetary referendums on the major events and actions affecting all of mankind.

The economy will supersede politics and market competition will sweep all the countries' customs barriers. The state will become more concerned with its citizens' care than traditional security, and it will usher in the era of global democracy.

This theory coincides with the main features of the theory of globalization and presents itself as a stage towards the replacement of the unipolar world, but only on the conditions promoted today by the U.S. and Western countries in regards to their socio-political, technological, and economic models (liberal democracy). These and their values will become a universal phenomenon, and the need for the strict protection of democratic and liberal ideals will no longer exist – all regimes that resist the West, democratization, and Americanization at the time of the onset of the nonpolar world should be eliminated.

The elite of all countries should be similar, homogeneous, capitalist, liberal, and democratic - in other words, "Western" – regardless of historical, geographic, religious, and national origin.

The project of the nonpolar world is supported by number of very powerful political and financial groups, from the Rothschilds to George Soros and his foundations.

This structural project addresses the future. It is thought of as a global formation that should replace unipolarity and be established after in its wake. This is not an alternative, but rather a continuation, and it will be possible only as society's center of gravity moves from today's mix of alliance of two levels of hegemony - material (the American military-industrial complex and Western economy and resources) and spiritual (standards, procedures, values) – to a purely intellectual hegemony, together with the gradual reduction of the importance of material domination.

Namely, this is the global information society, where the main processes of ruling and dominion will be deployed in the field of intelligence via the control of minds, mind control, and the programming of the virtual world.

The multipolar world cannot be combined with the nonpolar world model because it does not accept the validity of the unipolar moment as a prelude to the future world order, nor the intellectual hegemony of the West, the universality of its values, or the dissipation of decision-making into the planetary multiplicity regardless of the preexisting cultural and civilizational identity. The nonpolar world suggests that the American melting pot model will be extended to the whole world. As a result, this will erase all the differences between peoples and cultures, and an individualized, atomized humanity will be transformed into a cosmopolitan 'civil society' without any borders. Multipolarity implies that the centers of decision-making must be high enough (but not solely in the hands of one entity - as it is today

under the conditions of the unipolar world), and cultural specialties of each particular civilization must be preserved and strengthened (but not dissolved into a single cosmopolitan multiplicity).

Multipolarity is Not Multilateralism

Another model of the world order, somewhat distanced from direct U.S. hegemony, is a multilateral world (multilateralism). This concept is very widespread in the U.S. Democratic Party, and is formally adhered to in the foreign policy of President Obama's Administration. In the context of American foreign policy debates, this approach is opposed to the neoconservatives' insistence on unipolarity.

In practice, multilateralism means that the U.S. should not act in the field of international relations relying entirely upon its own strength and putting all of its allies and "vassals" before the fact in a mandated manner. Instead, Washington should take into account the position of partners, persuade and argue its suggested solutions in equal dialogue with them, and bring them over to its side by means of rational arguments and, sometimes, compromise proposals.

The United States in such a situation should be "first among equals", rather than "dictator among its subordinates". This imposes on the foreign policy of the United States certain obligations to allies in global politics and demands obedience to overall strategy. The overall strategy in this case is the West's strategy to establish global democracy, the market, and the implementation of the ideology of human rights on a global scale. In this process, the U.S., being the leader, should not directly equate its national interests with the "universal" values of Western civilization, on whose behalf they act. In some cases, it is more preferable to operate in a coalition, and sometimes even to make concessions to its partners.

Multilateralism differs from unipolarity by the emphasis on the West in general, and especially on its "value-based" (i.e. the "normative") component. Concerning this, apologists of multilateralism converge with those who advocate the nonpolar world. The only difference between multilateralism and nonpolarity is only the fact that multilateralism places emphasis on the coordination of democratic Western countries among themselves, and nonpolarity also includes non-state authorities (NGOs, networks, social movements, etc.) as actors.

It is significant that in practice, Obama's policy of multilateralism, as repeatedly voiced by him and former U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, is not much different from the direct and transparent imperialist era of George W. Bush, during whose period the neoconservatives were dominant. U.S.

military interventions continued (Libya), and U.S. troops maintained their presence in occupied Iraq and Afghanistan.

The multipolar world doesn't match with the multilateral world order because it opposes the universalism of Western values and does not recognize the legitimacy of the "rich North" - either alone or collectively - to act on behalf of all humanity and serve as the single center of decision-making on most majorly important issues.

Summary

The differentiation of the term "multipolar world" from the chain of alternative or similar ones outlines the semantic field in which we will continue to build the theory of multipolarity. Up until this point, we have talked only of what the multipolar world order is not, denials and differentiations themselves which allow us in contrast to distinguish a number of constituent and quite positive characteristics.

If we generalize this second positive part, arising from the series of made distinctions, we get approximately this picture:

1. The Multipolar world is a radical alternative to the unipolar world (that in fact exists in the present situation) due to the fact that it insists on the presence of a few independent and sovereign centers of global strategic decision-making on the global level.
2. These centers should be sufficiently equipped and financially and materially independent to be able to defend their sovereignty in the face of a direct invasion by a potential enemy on the material level, and the most powerful force in the world today should be understood as this threat. This requirement is reduced to being able to withstand the financial and military-strategic hegemony of the United States and NATO countries.
3. These centers of decision-making must not accept the universalism of Western standards, norms, and values (democracy, liberalism, free market, parliamentarism, human rights, individualism, cosmopolitanism, etc.) and can be completely independent of the spiritual hegemony of the West.

4. The multipolar world does not imply a return to the bipolar system because today there is no single strategic or ideological force that can single-handedly resist the material and spiritual hegemony of the modern West and its leader, the United States. There must be more than two poles in a multipolar world.

5. The multipolar world does not seriously consider the sovereignty of existing nation-states, which is declared only on a purely legal level and is not confirmed by the presence of sufficient power, strategic, economic, and political potential. In the XXI century, it is no longer enough to be a nation-state in order to be a sovereign entity. In such circumstances, real sovereignty may be only achieved by a combination and coalition of states. The Westphalian system, which continues to exist de-jure, no longer reflects the realities of the system of international relations and requires revision.

6. Multipolarity is not reducible to nonpolarity nor to multilateralism because it does not put the center of decision-making (pole) into the world government, nor to the club of the U.S. and its democratic allies ("global West"), the level of sub-state networks, NGOs, and other entities of civil society. A pole must be localized somewhere else.

These six points define the entire range for the further development of multipolarity and sufficiently embody its main features. Though this description significantly moves us towards understanding the point of multipolarity, it is still insufficient to be qualified as a theory. This is merely an initial determination with which the full theorizing just begins.

Multipolarity, Unipolarity, Hegemony - Theories and Concepts

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Today's lecture is very charged with meaning. The content of this lecture is very dense. I am going to present a new approach to International Relations. I made the first lecture here on classical and post-positive theories of International Relations, and in the second lecture I presented the basic principles of Geopolitics. Now I will evoke and use these concepts of International Relations as well as Geopolitics in order to explain what unipolarity, multipolarity, and hegemony are.

Let us establish some relations. In order to understand what multipolarity and the Theory of the Multipolar World are, we need to understand what unipolarity is. Unipolarity is precisely what we have in concrete politics after the fall of the Soviet Union. That was declared the "unipolar moment." Multipolarity is the concept or theory that challenges this unipolarity. There is a kind of opposition or confrontation between the unipolar and multipolar world visions. Unipolarity is based on some theoretical principles - geopolitical, ideological, and economic - and the same will be the case for multipolarity. But unipolarity exists, whereas multipolarity does not exist yet - it is in transition, but not yet achieved. We are speaking about something that is in reality, but that is ending, and something that is new, that hasn't yet come or been totally realized. We are in a transition from unipolarity towards multipolarity. We know what unipolarity is, but we do not know what multipolarity will be. This is an open, very passionate question. It is a little bit of a futurological perspective.

There are many theories of International Relations. One of the most famous theories is that of the bipolar world system proposed by Kenneth Waltz, with the division into capitalist and socialist camp, or West and East, which, according to Waltz, represented a kind of balance. In this system, one pole limits the other, they can cooperate, and their dialogue, confrontation, and opposition creates this system. The Third World was possible because of bipolarity and a kind of space between the two. Thanks to the bipolar system, everybody else could exist "on the margins" of this general world system.

But when the Soviet Union collapsed, there was the new idea of unipolarity promoted by some realists in International Relations, first of all Robert Gilpin. Instead of a bipolar system of plus and minus of two poles interacting in opposition, for example in which the Americans and the West are the plus, and ourselves, the "Eastern", being the minus, Gilpin proposed a different concept or system for International Relations in which there is one pole, the absolute center of everything, i.e., there is no more minus, only the center on the rise. Robert Gilpin won his theoretical debates with Kenneth Waltz, because Waltz supposed that bipolarity would last forever in some way, because it was a more conservative, stable world system. Gilpin proposed the possibility of a unipolar situation.

Unipolarity gained ground in theoretical debates in International Relations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. That moment was precisely declared the "unipolar moment" by Charles Krauthammer. The "unipolar moment" meant the creation of the concept of a unipolar system with a pole and a periphery in concrete reality. But Krauthammer was not sure if this would last forever, or if it would end in time. He was not sure if it was a world order or some temporary situation. So he called the "unipolar moment" this very correct term. After the end of the Soviet Union, there was precisely a confirmation of the unipolar system, for example on other levels, such as declared by Francis Fukuyama as the "End of History." There were no confronting poles or systems, there was only one system: liberal capitalist democracy with the market society, with the West recognized by everyone as the "global leader." Thus, there was the West and the Rest. The Rest should follow the West - that was the essence of unipolarity. There is only pole, one system, a global system - that is globalization. So unipolarity was the understanding in realist terms of the same concept as globalization, the End of History, or the unipolar moment.

It is interesting that in the very beginning of the 2000's, this same Krauthammer declared that maybe the unipolar moment has ended. This was after the 9/11 attack by Islamic terrorists on the New York Trade Center, and after Putin's coming to power. Then it seemed that the unipolar moment was no longer a unipolar world order, that something went "wrong" with unipolarity. "Normally" there should not have been such a thing as the terrorist attack of 9/11, because there was no state that could attack the United States, no civilization, no political system, no nuclear weapons - nothing structural or symmetric with American power and American domination. Russia at that moment was in a very low situation with Yeltsin and was on the verge of collapse after the Soviet Union. But Putin began to reaffirm Russia as a sovereign country. This was a kind of challenge to the unipolar system. For example, in 2007 Putin made his Munich speech which challenged precisely unipolarity and Western hegemony. In 2008, despite American support for Georgia, Russia intervened in Northern Ossetia and Abkhazia. In

2014, we reunified with Crimea, and then we intervened in Syria. In parallel, there has been a huge rise in China's model, as Zhang Weiwei says. China's model was a kind of new hegemony appearing on the horizon.

This means that there was something moving against unipolarity. Yet unipolarity still prevails in the global analysis. Unipolarity is ending, but the unipolar moment is lasting, it is still here. It is absolutely clear to everybody that something is wrong with unipolarity, that unipolarity is unstable and in decline, but it is still here, and no other political or international system has arisen. We are living in the end of unipolarity.

Unipolarity includes different aspects. For example, we could divide unipolarity into groups of concepts - open or "explicit", and hidden, "secret", or "implicit" unipolarity. Open (explicit) unipolarity is Neoconservatism in the United States and the Project for a New American Century promoted by the Neocons. They declare that the liberal world should rule the world, and that liberal countries should prevail and openly dominate everybody else. America should rule the world, and give the example and install the norms for other countries and cultures. Niall Campbell Ferguson, an English scholar of IR, has declared that we need to use the word "empire" to qualify what unipolarity is: it is a modern or post-modern Western empire that should dominate the whole planet. Ferguson says that we should not hesitate to use the word "empire", which has been demonized and criticized, but we are now living in an empire. The metropolis, the center of this empire, is the Western world, the Rich North, and there are other "provinces" of this "empire" that should be ruled from the center. So let us speak about the Western, post-modern, global, liberal, capitalist, Neo-colonial empire in all of these senses. This is open, explicit unipolarity as it is presented in IR debates.

The Pentagon's vision of unipolarity is clear if we take a look at the strategic map of the planet. We will see all around, except in China and Russia, American military bases. That is a concrete manifestation of unipolarity. The United States has tried to control the Pacific, Asia, Europe, Africa, the Arab world, and with NATO. The Pentagon vision is still absolutely unipolar. American national interests and American security are considered by the Pentagon to be a universal value. In their vision, it is your duty, for all of you and us, to defend American interests. Everyone who challenges American domination is a "terrorist" and is treated theoretically or practically as very dangerous. Any man, movement, or country who does not agree with this Pentagon vision is an enemy. That is open unipolarity. Regarding Europe, this idea is translated into Atlanticism and represented by NATO. NATO is the European world under the military control of the United States. That is one of the expressions of unipolarity. NATO is a unipolar

organization which tries to control the world for the benefit of only one pole. That is explicit, manifested unipolarity.

There is another “hidden”, “secret” or “implicit” unipolarity, that is globalism, multilateralism, and so-called “No Polarity” promoted by the chief of the Council on Foreign Relations. We roughly we call this “globalization.” Globalization means that all systems, societies, peoples and countries in the world will accept the Western way of progress, development, human rights, democracy, and liberalism. And when this happens, there will be no great differences between the United States, Russia, China, or Africa. Everyone will be “equal.” But in what sense? Everybody will become Americans, Western, and everybody must like liberal democracy and human rights. This is a special kind of globalism. It is not a dialogue between countries, cultures, and civilizations. For example, Russia has proposed Russian values, and China has proposed a Chinese identity. But there should not be any collective identity in this concept of globalization. Everybody should be equal precisely because everyone should only be statistical individuals - no cultures, no religions, no ethnic roots. That is the idea of “human rights”, to put together citizen and man. Every man is already a citizen. There are no countries, no nations, only the “global society” and “global civil society.” This is not openly unipolar, because globalists do not say that America will rule the world but that “you, citizens of the world, will rule the world in a global government” in which everyone will “participate.” Everyone will be equal “if you accept our system of liberalism, democracy, progressivism, human rights, individualism, and our culture” - you will no longer be treated in a hierarchical manner. The “world citizen” or “cosmopolitan” is a program that is unipolar on the level of values. That is pure unipolarity in a special, hidden sense.

Multilateralism is the geopolitical application of globalism. Multilateralism is a form of unipolarity, but it consists of the proposition that the United States should rule the world “with.” This is a kind of sharing of responsibility for ruling the world through proxies of the United States. Multilateralism is precisely giving to others the responsibility to rule the world with the United States as proxies, as a kind of vassals of the US. There are different countries that want to do this because they will have some special preferences within the global world-system.

Strategic unipolarity includes Atlanticism, Sea Power in geopolitical terms, and full spectrum dominance doctrine, which affirms that in order to dominate the world totally, the West should not only use hard power or military power, but also soft power, culture, technology, network services, networks, and social services, that should control other societies from the inside, not only from the outside. That is the idea of full spectrum domination - domination of the air, the cosmos, space, sea, land, and inside human

brains. That is a project of controlling human behavior, psychology, being, and human minds, by coding them through different methodologies.

Here is the geopolitical vision of unipolarity with the United States in the center.

This is also the classical geopolitical map of how Sea Power should control Land Power. From the seas and oceans, Sea Power - the United States and the global West - should control Land Power. The idea is to fight for Rimland, which is the zone between Land Power and Sea Power, the coastal zone. This is the classical vision which is still the main basic map of the Pentagon. The Pentagon understands the world more or less with this map. China belongs to the coastal area, to Rimland, so it is considered to be neither a radical enemy, nor a friend, but a zone to control.

Here is implicit unipolarity, a kind of multilateralism, quite different from unipolarity. In multilateralism, there is the main power, the global hegemon, and two main satellites - Europe and China. Europe is inscribed and embedded in the latent structure, and for China the globalists have proposed the G2 project. Hillary Clinton came to Beijing in order to propose this to the Chinese government. That is more or less the idea of how the world will be if unipolarity and multilateralism prevail. In the other spaces, there should be only chaos, not pro-American governments, because they don't need pro-American governments, which are too difficult to manage, and they have indeed destroyed pro-American governments in Tunisia and Egypt. They don't care anymore if you are pro-American or anti-American, because you should all only follow the Americans, or you will die in bloody chaos. And they have started this bloody chaos in North Africa, promoting cultural revolutions, supporting all kinds of terrorist groups in order to have reasons to intervene. By creating chaos in this region, unipolarity conserves its power. Russia has the same destiny. If we read carefully the book of Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard*, he has written that Russia should be torn apart and Balkanized, transformed in conflict between different ethnic and religious groups.

There are two parties in the United States and global government - the explicit unipolar and implicit unipolar. There is the "soft" version, and the previous map is the "hard" version. These are the pigeons and the hawks.

Ideological unipolarity entails the universalism of Western values and Human Rights ideology with the concept of human vs. citizen. The concept of human in Human Rights theory is against the nation-state and against the concept of citizen. If you say that the human being has the same rights as the citizen, you destroy citizenship. Migration and the defense of migrants are not purely humanitarian, but ideological. It is the idea to destroy the concept of citizenship, nationality, and the state. That is one of the main goals of the so-called human rights movement. It is purely ideological - as much ideological as Marxism or National Socialism. It is pure propaganda, nothing humanitarian. If you share human rights values, you are globalists on one side, sharing an ideology just like racism in National Socialism or communism and the proletarian position in classical Marxism. Human rights is a liberal ideology. It is not neutral. It is not self-evident. It is purely ideology, just as belongingness to the Aryan race or the capitalist or proletarian classes is. If you are in favor of human rights, you are already totally controlled by ideology.

The deconstruction of the nation-state is the main goal of liberalism in IR. Globalization is the technological and economic process, and globalism is the ideology of the unification of humanity under a world government. They are different, but are not in contradiction. By promoting the same technology and economy, at the same time you are preparing the ground for political integration - from globalization to globalism there is one step. They are two levels of the same process. You could promote the theory that we need global government in order to avoid war and the destruction of the humanity, or you can put it into practice without expecting that everyone will accept it. So globalism and globalization are two different things, but are converging forces.

Liberalism in International Relations is the theoretical basis for this ideological unipolarity, as it is itself an ideology. The idea of world government is not an obsession of conspiracy theorists. It is part of the classical manuals of International Relations. If you carefully read all and any manuals on IR, you will discover that Liberalism in International Relations affirms that there should be a world government, a supranational system that will replace states in the future and progress in order to secure world peace. This is not a conspiracy theory - it is purely a theoretical term from IR as an established discipline.

Hegemony has different meanings. First of all, there is the strategic dimension. This Greek word means "leadership" - a hegemon is a leading force or leading power. Hegemony could be understood and read as unipolarity as in Gilpin's system. If we use the term hegemony in its singular form, with one hegemon or one empire, then we are speaking about unipolarity. In the singular, hegemony represents the

concept of a dominating pole - that is the Western pole. Relative hegemony is an interesting concept of Mearschmeier, an American specialist in International Relations, who tries to impart a kind of relative approach to hegemony. According to Mearschmeier, there is no clear or abstract law as to whether we should have one or many hegemonies. It is an open question: let us consider hegemony as an existing phenomenon without predicting that there will be only one, two, three, or four.

In the case of the globalist vision, hegemony acquires a purely ideological dimension. It is not leadership in the military and strategic domination, but it is ideological and cultural, a domination of values and cultural patterns. Therefore, you are under hegemony, because you follow rules that are not established by you. These rules are so-called "universal" because the West was capable of imposing these on everyone else.

The Neoconservative version is the same as unipolarity - the strategic, open, explicit hegemony of the American Empire. Or there is Trump's vision for the New Liberal Order which is a little less defined, and not so much scientific. But Trump says "Let's Make America Great Again." What he means - nobody knows. He is against the globalist version, which he criticizes. His is not so much Neo-conservative because he was criticized during his election campaign by Neocons very severely. This is a rather "rare" hegemony, which might not be hegemony at all. Trump uses some concepts with no clear meaning. This is important, because it could serve as a kind of transition from hegemonic order to post-hegemonic order.

The main question of hegemony is whether there is one hegemony or hegemonies. The same question is whether there is one civilization or civilizations in the plural. This letter "s" at the end of the word changes everything - whether you are an enemy or friend, black or white, old or young. If there is only Civilization, there can be but one ideology, but if there are civilizations, there are completely different, even opposite ideologies and world visions. Whether we recognize the multitude of civilizations and hegemonies, or if you consider only one hegemony or empire, one letter divides two world visions.

In the Western mind, there is an implicit hierarchy dealing with different kinds of societies - either in the historical way, or in International Relations. There is a hierarchy in International Relations in a cultural

sense as well. All types of societies are clearly divided (by the West) into three categories: Civilization, which is the West, Barbarity, which is the East, and Savagery, which is the South. Civilization is "good" and "perfect order"; Barbarity is not so good and only semi- or quasi-ordered; while Savagery is not order at all. Before the end of the Second World War, before racist National Socialism, the West used the metaphors of skin [color] in order to explain this hierarchy. Civilization was "white", Barbarity was "yellow", and Savagery was "black." That was a normative racist attitude. But after the end of the Third Reich, it was impossible to use this racist approach anymore, and everybody became "internationalists." This racist mark was abolished and "forgotten." But the sense of the hierarchy is the same, only in other terms. For example, there is the technologically developed West with Human Rights, liberalism, individualism, and social security. This is a kind of law that cannot be challenged. There is the most developed society that is Western civilized society, there is the second world of the BRICS countries trying to keep up with the West to have the same standards but still in "delay." And there is the third world that cannot enter Civilization. Even without biological racism, we have the same concept of racism in this distinction, because there is only one Civilization, only one example, only one norm - the West. Corruption, totalitarianism, and authoritarianism are reserved for the Rest under the West or the "second-hand West", such as Russia and China. In Wallerstein's doctrine, there is the core, the Rich North, the semi-periphery, and the periphery. We deal with this hierarchy everywhere - today without "Racism", but racism is embedded in this attitude.

If we consider this concept carefully, we can deconstruct all the discourses in International Relations on the West. John Hobson's book on the Eurocentric conception of International Relations explains that perfectly.

The very idea of hegemonies and civilizations is based on the fact that there are many civilizations, not only the Western one. Other civilizations are neither barbarous nor savage, but merely of different types. If we are dealing not with barbarity or 'under-civilization', the West loses its universal, normative meaning. It is one among different possible civilizations. This hierarchy is destroyed, deconstructed, because there is no common universal measure of more or less developed. If you consider living in the forest with animals and without technological devices your choice or destiny, you have all the rights to do so and we will not teach you how to behave - that is a very humanistic attitude.

All of this system, the Western colonial system of hegemony and unipolarity, explodes immediately because it loses ground in International Relations - there is the total decolonization of the world - if we accept the fact of civilizations. There could not be any hierarchy between civilizations - all civilizations are equal, not in the sense of similar, but in that their differences cannot be put into an hierarchical taxonomy. We need to accept them as existing not only in different spaces, but different times, ontologies, and anthropologies. We cannot judge one civilization by criteria taken from another.

For example, in your case, the Chinese could think that some rights in Christianity, liberal society, or in African tribes are disgusting or unacceptable. You will treat them from the Chinese point of view. The same for them: they could find something completely unacceptable in your civilization or ours. But nobody can say "you are wrong, we are right." There are no unique, universal criteria. We need to accept this diversity in a positive way. Let it be like it is. That means a total, absolute epistemological revolution against Western universalism. And that demands de-colonization.

Antonio Gramsci used the term hegemony in an ideological sense. How could a Marxist, supposed to be a materialist and explain everything in terms of economic relations, arrive at an ideological understanding of hegemony and capitalism as hegemony? Gramsci proposed a very interesting vision which is very important for the Chinese. Economics is at the base, while politics is on the top as, according to Marx, economics is essential for politics, which are only the expression of economics. But when Gramsci analyzed the Soviet experience and Leninism, he arrived at the conclusion that in the Russian Empire there was no proletarian class. Our country, Russia, in the beginning of the 20th century, was not industrialized and there was no proletarian class. So a revolution from a Marxist point of view was impossible. Marx and Engels affirmed exactly the same thing for Russia and the East - before their full capitalization, including through their colonial experience, towards which Marx was very positive and even in favor of colonization because it brought capitalism into pre-capitalist societies and prepared the future proletarian revolution. But what was Leninism? How was a proletarian revolution possible without a proletarian class?

Gramsci explained by his theory that sometimes the will of a political group can go ahead of economic processes. In some situations, political will can replace the economic basis and transform the economy in order to satisfy all the conditions of Marxism - to create artificially a proletarian class out of peasants. The other way was Mao's theory, who recognized - against Marx - the peasantry as a revolutionary class, which was much more honest and sincere in Mao's case, less so in the case of Lenin, but Gramsci grasped this well. Gramsci developed this idea to affirm that sometimes culture is more important than politics. You can be active in culture without being linked to a political, proletarian communist party and without any relation to politics or economics, you can create a kind of historical pact. Intellectuals can make a pact with capital and serve capital without being part of the bourgeois class. You can serve capital in your mind. Or, even being rich, prosperous, and a part of this bourgeois system, you can choose the working class and fight against capitalism. Thus, culture has the same autonomy from politics as politics has from economics. That is maybe the case of China: you are using capitalism, but in order to promote your society and your ideals.

Hegemony in Gramsci means that the West and global capitalism try to use not only economics and markets, and not only the political expression of such, democracy and parliamentarism, but also culture. Precisely those intellectuals who make the historical pact with capital are the worst. Hegemony is first and foremost a cultural phenomenon. This means that it is not a political ideology, but a kind of metaphysical decision. You can be in favor of capital as a system, as a metaphysical principle of the total liberation of the individual from any kind of collective identity, or you can choose fidelity to the working class, country, society, identity. It is up to you. Nothing can oblige a human being to serve political or economic interests. The intellectual, who represents all of society, since everybody according to Gramsci is a little bit of an intellectual, represents the integrity of human society as professional thinkers. But an intellectual cannot think outside of the main metaphysical choice between capital and the working class.

So, hegemony is first and foremost a metaphysical principle. You could be on the side of hegemony while living in a socialist society, or being poor, or being a member of a Communist Party. To choose hegemony is an inner orientation. Hegemony penetrates society not only with political and economic structures, but in the mind and heart. It is a metaphysical virus. Hegemony is a metaphysical liberalism, under which you work only in its favor.

Now we finally arrive at multipolarity.

In order to clarify what multipolarity is, we need to establish some oppositions. Multipolarity is against unipolarity. Multipolarity is against globalism. Multipolarity is against multilateralism. Multipolarity is against hegemony in the singular. Multipolarity is against hegemony on three levels - first of all strategic, i.e., against the American military domination of the world with American military bases everywhere in the world except for American soil. America for Americans - maybe that's what Trump meant. "Yankee go Home." Multipolarity is against ideological hegemony as globalization, liberalism, human rights. Multipolarity is against hegemony in Gramsci's concept as a metaphysical, historical pact made by organic intellectuals. The last definition is that multipolarity is pluriversal - this is a concept introduced

by Carl Schmitt. In universalism, there is one unique concept of norms and values. "Pluriversal" means the free movement in different directions without one measure for all kinds of societies.

Multipolarity in geopolitics deals with Carl Schmitt's concepts of Big Spaces or Grossraum, and it is here that we come to the concept of "pole" in multipolarity. How do we define a pole? A pole is a "big space" and civilization. A pole is not only strategic or political; it is linked to a civilization as a culture or special type of society with special values. At the same time, it is not only a culture, but also a strategic space. Thus, in the concept of pole, we have both meanings: power and idea. The ideological and cultural levels and military force are inscribed into the pole in space, in political geography, and in cultural geography at the same time.

Here we can see a very approximate map of different big spaces that should or could be poles of the multipolar world order. Some of them are already poles - such as the United States of America. The European big space could exist and has many possibilities to become an independent pole; China is certainly the main precedent for an independent pole; and Putin's Russia is trying to be a pole by acting independently from others. That is clear enough in Russian sovereignty regained in Putin's time. And there is, for example, the Indian big space: economically and demographically India has the possibility to become such a pole. Latin America thinks in the same terms. The Islamic world tries, at least on the theoretical level, to become a pole as well. Africa is less developed and the Pacific big space are less developed. This does not mean "developed" in the sense of culture of civilization - they have their own great civilizations, but as a pole, on the level of power, they might only become poles in the future in the multipolar system. That is the map of the multipolar world order. I have already shown the maps of the globalists, the Pentagon, and CFR. This is the Russian map of multipolarity.

But what is important on the practical level is what we have now, or what we will have tomorrow, and that is a kind of aspiration towards multipolarity. We can see three poles accepted more or less in the multilateralist, globalist version - the American zone, European zone, and Chinese zone. But as we have

seen, the multilateralist approach is hidden unipolarity and thinks that there should be chaos everywhere outside of these three.

The majority of Western experts and analysts are totally biased, because the science of International Relations itself is totally biased, Eurocentric. Before being accepted into academic society, you should conclude your pact with capital. They try to use the Gramscian concept as well - they do not let persons who do not share their Western-centric vision. One Canadian-Jewish, Michael Millerman, wrote a philosophical thesis on my ideas, and he was threatened with being thrown out of the academic field and Western universities because he treated my ideas in a neutral way and not blatantly. His was a more or less balanced or neutral philosophical analysis, but he was threatened by the academic society with being thrown out, because if you are on the Western side, you should only criticize and demonize the opponent - that is the normal rule.

In mainstream political analysis, there is no recognition of this fourth pole of Eurasia is absent in all future descriptions of reality. There are different versions on the fate of Europe, how China will be, whether it will become the main enemy of the United States, and there are many details that differ and different viewpoints that are accepted - but when they approach Eurasia and Russia, there is a univocal decision of all scholars that there will be "no Russia" and 'no fourth pole.'" Because if there is this fourth pole today, then every situation in the world order changes - it is not bipolar world order at all, because Russia is big even after losing half of its territory and population after the collapse of the Soviet Union. With us as a pole, the meaning of China, the meaning of Europe, and the possibility for all other countries and civilizations to affirm themselves as independent poles, is gained. That is a crucial point. Russia, once more in history, is in the right place at the right time. That is the key problem for multipolarity.

If we accept that there will be no more Russia, only a Balkanized, chaotic territory as was more or less the case in Yeltsin's time, then we have unipolarity, hegemony, globalization, and China and Europe are proxies of the West in the multilateral world vision. With the fourth pole, we have a complete different situation. Thanks to the existence of this fourth pole that could not be universal, that could not be dominating through hegemony over China or Europe - we just cannot, we have no universal ideology or ideology at all in Russia. Our weakness could be used in our favor, because now we are in a position when we can save Russia by saving others - Europe and China - from Western domination. Without this, we cannot be sure of our future. That is a purely pragmatic vision.

With this fourth pole, we have real multipolarity with the opportunity for the independence of Latin America, possible independence for the Islamic world, possible independence for the African world,

India - everybody acquires the chance to transform into a pole and defend their own civilization. This time, Russia proposes neither colonialism, as in Tsarist times, nor some ideology. We just want to defend ourselves as a civilization different from both Eastern and Western. In the concept of multipolarity, Russia is not a country or Western country, but an independent civilization that is partly Western, partly Eastern, but neither Eastern nor Western, but a particular Russian civilization.

The acceptance of this fourth pole changes the whole picture. Now we have multipolarity. Starting with these four poles, we can go further and propose a special role to India, the Islamic world, and Latin America, as is more or less represented in BRICS.

Here we can see the difference between the multipolar and multilateral maps. They are completely different approaches. I call this "more-than-three-polar" world or 4+ world a precise dividing line between two world orders that can be established in the future. Now we are in a transition. We are at the bifurcation point, we can go either way. Nothing is granted. We are living in the end of unipolarity, but we have not yet created a multipolar world order. This process is open. We could be successful or unsuccessful. We are here precisely between.

This state of things is more or less consciously understood by some academic groups in the world. We can call that the "multipolar world theory." My own book in Russia, *The Theory of the Multipolar World*, which has been translated into French, is in the process of being published in English, has been translated into Portuguese, Spanish, and other languages, presents this theory, and tries to put all of these elements that I have explained together. Eurasianism is also being developed by our group as a political philosophy that insists that Russia is not a country, but a civilization, and is part of multipolarity. The Fourth Political Theory is another theory developed by us in Russia along with French and Italian intellectual groups, that invites to overcome the classical Western political ideologies - Liberalism, Communism, and Fascism. The Fourth Political Theory invites to go beyond Liberalism, and to be anti-Liberal, but not to be Communist, Fascist, or Nationalist. It is outside of them, because the Fourth Political Theory does not recognize the universalism of the modern West. For us, it is an invitation to provincialize the West, to show that it is one province of the world, not the center. There are many centers and provinces in multipolarity. The Fourth Political Theory is the political expression of multipolarity.

In China, Professor Zhao Tingyang with his concept of Tianxia Tixi, develops the concept of a special Chinese model not only as pure domination by force of strength, badao, but as wangdao, or the concept of moral and ethical hegemony. That concept of wangdao describes not only China as a state, but also other countries that influence China not necessarily in a direct, hegemonic way as in badao. This is a very multipolar approach among Chinese scholars. Yan Xuetong is a realist in International Relations, but his defense of Chinese identity can be regarded as part of multipolarity. At the same time, he challenges the concept of pole and prefers to speak about "units." Your famous Zhang Weiwei's offers a very important defense of the particularity of the Chinese way of development. It is a defense of Chinese identity. There is also Qin Yaqing, who applies to IR a conceptualization of different interactions, casual and ordered, that form a kind of "game", based on different factors, that can be summarized in the traditional Chinese divination system.

In Europe, there is the New Right school. The European New Right is anti-liberal and anti-capitalist, and also includes Traditionalists. It is not the classical, American, or British "new Right" that is liberal. Alain de Benoist is the main philosopher of this school. They have developed a multipolar vision in which Europe should be an independent pole - completely independent from the United States of America, and very friendly towards Russia. They are promoting this in a theoretical way with the concept of Pluriversum, as they are followers of Carl Schmitt. They are a very influential and interesting group of thinkers.

In Latin America, there are different multipolar schools, for example the theory of "foundational non-subordination" promoted by Marcelo Gullo Omodeo in Argentina. There is the "Meridionalism" of Andre Martin in Brazil, concerned with the Global South, which is very close to the Eurasianist vision. There is also Norberto Ceresole, who was a Left Peronist and very influential on Hugo Chavez, his main ideologue, and a partisan for the unification of the Latin American space.

What is interesting here is that there are theories of multipolarity dealing precisely with where the possible poles are. We can see this in Russia, trying to develop multipolarity and affirm herself as a pole, in China trying to be more and more independent from Western hegemony, in Europe, which is trying to challenge Atlanticism, unipolarity, and American domination, and in Latin America. What is strange is that we lack an Islamic concept of a multipolar world. We have only a caricature in the Salafi version of the Caliphate that should be global, and that is impossible as well as theoretically unexplored. But an affirmation of Islamic identity and accepting of the realities of the world is lacking - I do not know why. My works have been translated into Turkish, Persian, and Arabic. There is a huge interest, but I do not know any serious theoretical constructions defending an independence of Islamic civilization. Everyone in Islam is in favor of that, but I am speaking not of the mood in the Islamic world, but of theoretical constructions. The same is the case in India. India pretends to be a very powerful hegemon in South

Asia, but there are no texts - it is a very profound, metaphysically developed civilization, but it does not show any signs of a theoretical multipolarity.

So, the theory of the multipolar world, the multipolar approach, challenges Eurocentrism, Modernity, Universalism, and Hegemony. It is based on the presumption of a multitude of civilizations and refuses a hierarchy of them. The multipolar approach is based on anthropological pluralism and a positive evaluation of diversity and new reading of the concept of Other. The Other is not the same or "more or less the same", it is completely unknown to the West, for whom the Other is "worse" in the traditional racist colonial attitude, or in the liberal attitude the Other is the same. The West lacks a third definition of the Other. Globalists say the Other is exactly the same as ourselves, while racists, colonialists, and nationalists say that they are better [than the Other]. Nowhere here is there the Other, because both are completely obsessed with themselves in a hyper-egoistic attitude. They put the Other only as the worst or the same, but where is the Other? The meaning of the Other is lost.

The theory of the multipolar is an anti-Eurocentric project for the re-provincialization of Europe, a return to the pre-Columbian vision. If we regard the pre-Columbian vision, we immediately discover that there was a perfect world order from a civilizational point of view, with no colonialism or Western domination. There were traditional empires - the Iranian Empire, the Ottoman Empire, the Russian Empire, the Chinese Empire, Arab Empire. Everybody was in the perfect place from a civilizational point of view, but Western Modernity imposed colonialism and hegemony on the planet. The separation between America and Europe that is part of the multipolar world is itself a kind of return to the pre-Columbian time. Now, in the present day, in Syria, the ancient empires have reemerged - we see Iran on the rise, Turkey on the rise, and we can see Russia and China. This is a sign of the return to the pre-Columbian world.

The theory of the multipolar world is anti-modern because modernity is Western. We could say that we propose an alternative modernity or alter-modernity, but we do not agree that modernity is destiny. Modernity was a choice of part of Western society and civilization that led to catastrophe. Maybe it was the path of the historical destiny of the West, but it was not our destiny. Modernity is a Western concept. The theory of the multipolar world rejects the principles of the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment is optional. Here I suggest reading the French author René Guénon, a French-born Catholic, a philosopher who converted to Islam in Cairo and spent the rest of his life there, entering a Sufi order. He is the greatest author, the founder of the Traditionalist school with a radical critique of modernity and Western universalism. I also recommend Julius Evola.

Introduction to Noomakhia (lecture 10) Noomahia in XXI Century

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Now, this is the last lecture, the 10th lecture that is a kind of result of this course that could be considered as Introduction to Noomahia. The 10th lecture is dedicated to Noomahia in 21st century. In the sociology, they say, now we are living in the shift, the transformation from modernity to the post-modernity. So we have identified the modernity as return or revenge of the Logos of Cybele. Now we could ask, 'what is the Logos of post-modernity?' 'What kind of noological structure is it?' The Logos of post-modernity is in some way the finalization of the Cybelian revolution. So that is the kind of bringing to the logical end, logical consequence of the previous modernity. So we should not be deceived by the anti-modern speech of the post-modernism. Post-modernism is essentially modern. It is the essence of the modernity. It is not alternative.

The post-modernism as it is, in the French philosophy first of all, is based on the idea that modernity is not enough. So modernity is not pure modernity. That began with Frankfurt School when they said that 'we need to enlighten enlightenment,' that 'enlightenment was not really enlightened so we need to purify the pure modernity' and that is a kind of purge or ethnical cleansing of modernity, all the rest of what was tradition. So, post-modernity is an idea to bring the modernity to the end, to create the 'pure modernity,' In philosophical sense, it is the idea to gain the pure imminence, or pure matter, or pure body as in Deleuzian version. So everything in the modernity according to postmodernists was too much penetrated by the pre-modern, by tradition, for example, the reason. Human reason was a kind of slogan in the fight against the theocracy, against the church, and against theology. That was all made in the name of the human reason. That was the vanguard position of the modern fight.

But postmodernists have discovered that after the victory of the human reason over theology, and creating absolutely autonomous science and philosophy, they, in new condition have encountered a kind of domination, a kind of philosophical fascism. But this time, human reason, human brains were considered to be radical dictatorship. So before, the idea in modernity was to liberate ('liberalism') human reason from theology. Now it is to liberate the human being from the reason because the reason is dictatorship. The reason predicts what to do. It deals with unbalanced radical hierarchical systems on the classes, on the classifications. So now, we need to come, in the postmodernity, with the next stage. Not the liberation 'of' the reason, but the liberation 'from' the reason.

That is the concept of schizophrenic revolution of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari that was anti-Oedipus. For example, the concept of Freud was a kind of modern revolution against rationality. So that was as well an introduction to postmodernism, because the reason was put under question, under doubt, in order to explain the functioning of the brain on the reason by irrational motivation of subconsciousness. But Deleuze and Guattari in the pure postmodernity have discovered that was a reflection of the male understanding of the functioning of subconsciousness. And the complex of Oedipus was a kind of male projection, so they proposed to create a female, feminist psychoanalysis that will not be affected with some paranoid particularly male concept of irrational desire. So that was the idea to bring to the end, all the irrationalism and they have discovered that there are two types of the psychological system; paranoid one and schizophrenic one. The paranoid one was hierarchical and that was considered the reason is paranoid according to Deleuze Guattari, but schizophrenia when there is a kind of inner split of the self, its much more feminist, its much more equalitarian. So we need to promote schizophrenic attitude as the normative attitude of society. And that is as well the kind of fight against the brain and dictatorship of the brain. So we need to liberate the organs, different organs. They should behave at their will without this 'Hitlerism' of mind. So postmodernism is the fight against any kind of vertical hierarchies, not only traditional way but in the individual way as well.

So that first was the fight against everything in the sake of individual and now that is the construction of individual itself that is considered to be too Apollonian (in our terms). Because the man is vertical, for example, it's not normal. It's creating a kind of privilege for the head, for the brain. It is at the top. We should make quite opposite. We should crawl as a serpent. We should give full freedom to our organs and consider our body not as kingdom of the reason, but as a kind of parliamentary assembly of the organs that could organize political parties, vote to take some decision, not only dictated by reason, but promoted and supported by the other organs. The most radical idea was that the organs themselves are totalitarian because they have too many special forms. They are adapted and adjusted to one mechanical function so we should consider the body without organs. That is the concept. So the body should exist without any form, without any organic state. That we could achieve during virtual existence. That is the two-dimensional space and we should emigrate into the network in order to fill not with organs but with all our body. So that is rhizome. It is the concept that should replace individual. Rhizome is network mankind that is not united and interacting with each other as individual with individual but with organ with organ, in the completely schizophrenic sense. So one hand could behave itself in its own way than the other part.

So that is as well, dissipation of the personality with avatars, with names in the networks. We could change the gender, change the age, and everything, and personality. We could dissipate ourselves. And that is not only roles, because the man in sociology is the assembly of the roles. These social roles and relational games are dissipated and distributed through the network and there are new kind of rhizomatic.

Rhizome in Greek is the root, but not the root of the plant, but the root as potato or mushroom. They are expanding not in the vertical but in the horizontal situation. And that is a kind of postmodern society that is the next step. That is not individual but dividual in some way. So there is a new stage of immanentism and materialism. It is not the materialism of the things. It is materialism of something that is below the things, beneath the things. Rene Guenon called that 'infra-corporeal world' and this 'infra-corporeal world' was peopled in the traditional religious understanding by purely underground beings. The idea to turn the man in the assembly of the daemons. That is the idea of Deleuze. And to open the possibility of the material spirit living through us and in us to reveal themselves and behave themselves freely as a kind of parliament of organs or desires and the machines of desires distributed through the network. This is a kind of destruction of any vertical forms including in the early liberal or capitalist version. Here there is a very thin change from classical liberalism (first political theory) in post-liberalism. That is the mixture between communism, or Marxism, not defending proletarian or the class struggle but defending materialism and egalitarianism united with liberalism. So postmodernism is a kind of cultural Marxism mixed with the liberalism (left liberalism). That is a new version. Old liberalism operated, dealt with the individual. And now that is dividual that is coming.

Normal human reason is replaced by artificial intelligence. Networks should replace the normal relations. And virtuality is replacing reality. I have dedicated yesterday's lecture, presentation of the book 'network warfare' partly to this postmodern horizon, postmodern perspective. The idea is to replace what was, in the paradigm of modernity, called reality by virtuality. So virtuality is not only reflection of the reality. It is very interesting moment. In virtuality there is reflection of reality or translation of something real in something digital. After that, that is work with digital. Improvement for the sound for example, or image, photoshop working on the photo and so on, or cleaning of the sound on the music, and new emulation of the purified image in the reality. Printing in a 3-D printer, for example, printing back the reality. So the most important thing is the autonomy of what is digitalized. So this reality that is separated in the numbers in the computer, is considered most important thing. For example, the credit card. So they are numbers, something electronic, that is calculation process. We put money on the card and we take money. It comes through virtual instance. Here is the possibility to make with our money everything because they are not material. And virtuality is the idea when we don't make this kind of operation too often. We don't transform reality into virtuality and we don't emulate reality back. We are satisfied with staying with credit card. Not putting the money, not taking the money. We have credit card, and we are satisfied, we are happy. So, not trying to, how it works, not trying to put it back. We see how it works so we are happy with having a credit card.

So, offline relations between, for example, dating. There is the photo; the photo of girl and photo of man (I presume normal relations). And there is online encounter, meeting, and there is offline. Offline can be disappointing but when you prove, you testify of the quality, the reality of the girl or young man

you have seen in the internet in the reality, it's a kind of emulation of this virtual personality. But we are invited in the postmodernity to accept these virtual images as they are. Living there, not making this proof, test how they are. You could create your personality, and after in the future, you could create your body. And that has already begun, emulation of body, printing on the 3-D printers different organs. This is purely avatar. Or for example, amelioration of the body now, with botox for example, fighting against the aging, or making some artificial adjustments to women figure or male figure as well (in modern western society). So there is a kind of emulation of body. In that process, we are losing a kind of individual. We became the combination of the parts. We could transform into numbers and calculational sequence and we could be emulated. We could disappear in virtuality and reappear in reality, passing maybe ameliorating some features. So that is not only reflection. That is something when virtuality becomes primordial, becomes something that goes first. So we could for example, emulate something that doesn't exist in reality. For example, chimera, cyborg, centaurs, rusalki. We could print in the future and there are fantastic films about that, could print something that is not reflection of the reality, that is production of virtual fantasy. And we could people the world with these images and in some situations, when first we first received credit card, we were not so confident with it, we tried to have some machine in order to take money to be sure that they are there. But now, little by little, we are happy with having card. We don't testify anymore.

We have more and more confidence in something virtual and we are replaced, we are transferred into the realm of virtuality and we become more and more virtual. Artificial intelligence is the kind of limit of it. There will be not anymore separate individuals. There will be a kind of network. Because artificial intelligence is not like one clever guy or girl. It is network distributed through many computers. That is neural network that is capable to create something new, to imagine something new.

There are two different kinds of artificial intelligence; weak artificial intelligence and strong artificial intelligence. Weak artificial intelligence is already constructed. It is a kind of databases of many knowledge of humanity put into the digitalized way. There are great masses of books, of knowledge, of technology, all present in the computers. And we could immediately access this book and they are inside of memory. So if we could grant permanent access to that, we are inside of this weak artificial intelligence that could make calculations instead of us, make comparisons, translations of languages, so transmitting as well some semantic elements. And that is ameliorating each day Google translates from English and into English better, with other languages not so, but with English better and better. So we could see how this weak artificial intelligence progresses.

But there is strong artificial intelligence. It's appearance is awaited, anticipated for two thousand twenty, twenty five years, so it rests not so much time, and that is called singularity moment. Singularity moment is the appearance of the strong artificial intelligence that will be completely comparable with human. It will be not programmed operations but neural network. Neural network is algorithm

(mathematical) that could create something that wasn't from the beginning was put in. That is self development form of calculation. And the simplest neural network depends absolutely from operator. But developed neural networks are independent. More and more they become independent from operator so they could arrive at the conclusion that wasn't planned by operator. In that manner, human reason functions. That is something that is autonomous but following some rules because human reason as well is following some rules. And this singularity moment is considered to be the shift, the greatest shift in human history when there will be not only human reason in the earth, or in the space. There will appear something comparable to us, but the next evolution, next step of human progress. That will be post-human species, post-human beings.

And there is, in modern philosophy, a tendency that is called accelerationism that invites us to bring this singularity moment quicker, quick, now, accelerate towards this singularity situation. That is studied and done by great corporations, by Google, Microsoft, and others. That is as well a hedging process. They invest billions in the creation of artificial intelligence. And the billions as well in hedging, in security, trying to identify the threats of this. So that is hedge fund for artificial intelligence and the development projects for artificial intelligence.

At the same time, the concept of what is human has changed in post-modernity. So post-modernity is going towards post-human, in new step of evolution. Because modernity is based on the concept that human beings appeared as a kind of progress of beast, so singularity is the next step. There was the development as a beast, after that the development as a man, after that development as a machine. But artificial intelligence is not machine. It's something different. And what is interesting is that in order to have artificial intelligence, we need to understand that our brains as well are something artificial. So we could repeat our human brains only when they are considered to be something material, mechanical. And this is precisely the science of cognitivism, the conscious, the study of conscious body, conscious problem, trying to emulate the function of human reason. But in order to facilitate this, we need to turn present humans into machines. That will facilitate this process. And that is precisely the case.

And now the present human beings are more and more like the other. We are more and more artificial, because political correctness is new kind of totalitarianism.

They try to persuade us how its necessary to think, what is normative way of thinking, and praising the liberty and freedom. At the same time, we become less and less free. And any challenge to that process is regarded as a crime, as a mind crime, a crime of opinion. For example, if you don't agree with that, you are Fascist, if you try to defend something, for example, Auschwitz or Stalinists, that's the same. So you could not challenge evolution. You could not challenge the progress. For example, you could not say

‘stop let us conserve what is here.’ The hysterical reaction of American society against Trump’s victory is a demonstration of how intolerant progressivists are. Trump is not an alternative to that. He doesn’t plan to stop the researches into the artificial intelligence. He doesn’t protest against the gay prides and so on. He’s very tolerant. But he is less progressive than is needed so he is fascist. There are Russians who are fascist behind him. So if you aren’t a progressivist, you are an enemy of progress. All the consequences we could see in the prohibition of my book on Amazon, in the free world where everybody has absolute right to express anything, except if that is something that challenges the status quo. You are free, completely liberated to be liberal; right, left, center liberal. But you are not free not to be liberal. If you are not liberal, it’s suspicious. Maybe a terrorist or fundamentalist or Russian or Trumpist and so on.

That is now, a caricature. We see how this kind of political totalitarian propaganda works with no reason at all, because everything now is virtual. For example Russian intervention in the American elections. Virtual. There is no proof. And they could not prove it in the world of networks. There are repeated sentences. That is considered to be a kind of algorithm. For example, everybody cites the New York Times or Washington Post as if it is the truth, but it is algorithm. It is emulation of the status quo, that could be completely with no relations with the reality. Or you could easily exaggerate something, some little element, you could combine. For example, I’m giving many interviews to the western press, but only the fragments that correspond to what they expect from myself are shown. For example I gave to BBC interview that Russian oligarchs have financed Hillary Clinton’s campaign. No, no mention of that. When I was asked whether Russians intervened in the Trump elections, I answered ‘no’ and they said ‘yes.’ So if they receive completely opposite reaction, they don’t care. So they emulate what they need. That is a kind of emulation independent from previously destructed and processed information. So in postmodernity, the information goes first. And information you could imagine or combine. So nobody could verify. If we see the image, if we read something, if we repeat it, if it is distributed in many other agencies, then that is the truth. So it is emulation and not reflection.

In the metaphysical sense, that is the shift from the real to the virtual. So the virtuality is more important than reality. Because it is not reflection of reality but the basic emulation of reality. And there is indignation of the old style people who say ‘lets defend reality in front of virtuality’ but it is impossible because the reality was brought by the modernity. Because in the world of tradition, of Apollonian Logos, ideas existed. Ideas were the real beings, or spirit, or God, or something hidden, or something heavenly, or something divine, existed as the basic ontological argument for the reality. So reality took its being from the fact of being created by God. Creation was the ontological explanation of the reality. When we have made a step from the Logos of Apollo and the spiritual basis of the reality, when we have accepted the reason as such, the man as such, the world as such, nature as such, as substance without the author, we have already cut the relations with the metaphysical basis of the existence. Reality is virtual. That is why this shift from the reality to the virtuality is possible. Metaphysically speaking, we could not defend reality, without saving first spirituality. Because this metaphysical foundation of the

reality was not real, was pre-real. Ideas exist in the reality, eternal ideas of the thing. If we could cut them and deny that, we have the things, but the things, as reality, is not real in the last sense. It is already something virtual, something emulated, it is simulacrum and not the thing. And virtuality is the last conclusion of this process. In post-modernity, nothing new. It seems to be very new and very modern but it is logical conclusion of the modernity.

So if we consider now, what is noological analysis of post-modernity, we should recognize that it is not something new, comparing with modernity, but is the final phase of modernity. When we have spoken about the Logos of Cybele, the post-modernity is the absolute domination of the Logos of Cybele. Logos of Cybele was expanding during modernity and now it is already expanded. So there is the difference of moments of Noomahia. There is the fight and when the fight is over. So that is a kind of Kingdom of Scarlet Woman, in the Christian eschatological sense, and full domination of Great Mother, in its complete version. That is why there is feminism now.

Some words about feminism - there could be different forms of feminism. Modern feminism as well is different. But I would like to accentuate that there could be feminism that I'm calling Hecate feminism, that is based on the very special figure of Great Goddess Hecate, that was in the Greek history and early Greek history, Hesiod, described as the Goddess that gives every fruit, every desired thing, but when Hesiod mentions what Hecate gives, he has said 'the wisdom, the bravery, the victory in fight, and the cattle' and there was no mention of agricultural crop. So Hecate in the original sense was Turanian Goddess, was a kind of feminine archetype of Turanian type. Afterwards they were associated with Persephone or Demeter, and put into the realm of night and underground. But originally, Hecate wasn't chthonic deity. That was heavenly feminine female figure. And Hecate feminism, it is the dignity of the woman that reflects patriarchal values, as Athena (the other Greek deity). Athena is pure state of what is purely patriarchal; it is wisdom of the priests and the victory and heroism of the warrior. That was Hecate feminism. Maybe it could be returned to the Indo-European feminine principle from the wrong or deviated form of patriarchate, materialistic patriarchy. So Hecate feminism is restoration of the dignity of the woman as the friend and ally of the man, the Indo-European man. That is a kind of Indo-European feminism that is against the Logos of Cybele, because it is glorification of feminine principle of purely Indo-European Logos. So that is interesting that in Hindu tradition that is the concept of Shakti. Shakti is not something that goes against the male principle. It is a kind of power of this male principle. That is Shekhinah as well in the Kabbalah. So that is feminine principle of light and not chthonic deity, but that is not the case with today's feminism because post-modern feminism is absolutely anti-Indo-European and purely Cybelian.

And that is not the beginning of the liberation of the woman. It is a kind of total destruction of the man that began with the modernity. So, materialistic limits put on the man and discreditation of the priesthood, of the monks, the warriors as types was already the victory of the matriarchate. And

bourgeois type is matriarchal as such. And when women in the modern world pretend to have power, that is, as with Deleuzian metaphysics, is not something new. It's the finalization of the process. So the power of Cybele, today, is open and manifest. And interesting remark with feminism; traditionally women can't expect happiness; it could happen, it could not. It depends from some transcendental moment. The woman can meet the right man, have the right babies, and right families and be happy, or could not. That depends. But modern Cybelian feminism says let's say goodbye to this happiness. Feminine happiness is an illusion. It is more dreams, that is not real. There is no such kind of women happiness and every woman should say goodbye to that. There is no happiness, it is an illusion. It is patriarchal trick in order to keep women under control. You will never have feminine happiness but instead you can have power. So you exchange that problematic feminine happiness and non-problematic fight for power and will for power. So that is not a claim for more happiness or more equality. That is the fight for power in the society. And that has almost already succeeded. We are not in the beginning or first stages of feminism. We are in the last stages of feminism. And this fight for power and the concept of woman as power reflects the essence of the feminine principle in tradition because the pure state in the Indian tradition, in the Purusha, the male principle is wisdom with no power. It is pure light of thought. And the power is already feminine. But this liberation of the power from the wisdom is power as itself, a kind of blind power. That is what is going on with present day feminism. That is finally arriving to such absolute feminine power, woman loses herself, her nature, and her content. She becomes absolutely blind might, a kind of vitality. So there is the blind force of things themselves, pure gravity, pure matter, matter in the state of no orientation. So no more happiness, but new power, and emasculation and disappearance of man. Man should disappear. They lose man in such situation, their position, their archetype, and the idea of recognition of homosexuality as the norm in the western society is the end of the man, is the end of the balance between the genders, that is destroyed, everything is optional, you have not these two poles. And that is a victory of Cybele which is now open and manifest, not only implicit as in the modernity, but explicit, as now.

Now we are coming to post-liberalism. When liberalism, the first political theory is left alone, there is no second, no third. And when they try to exclude Fourth Political Theory as possibility. So, the first political theory is as well changed in a kind of post-liberalism. There is no more individual. There is the dividual, something divided, something tomic, as atom wasn't atomic. Atom, when it was discovered, it was as well recognized as something that you could divide more. So that is not atomic. Atom is undivided, indivisible. If there is something divisible, that is not atom. But you still call atom something that is divisible, so you still call individual something that is not anymore considered to be 'in-dividual,' 'in-divisible.' So it is something already rhizomatic. That is a transformation that goes with globalization. Globalization destroys any kind of society, including destroys modernity. Liberalism is devoided of any kind of national boundaries, borders. It is pure cosmopolitanism. There is no race, no ethnos, no society. Everybody could live in every point of the space. Today, it is the freedom of the individuals but tomorrow that will be the freedom of the networks. Because it is a kind of matrix with artificial intelligence and with bodies emulating bodies. The concept of body as well could change but we are promised to have immortality instead, but immortality of the machine, because the machine could not

die. The machine could be adjusted or decomposed or recomposed, so machine doesn't die. And when we say, we become immortal in the physical way, in the imminent way. In that moment we stop to be human. And that is singularity moment that is appointed for some years in front of us. We are living not in the hundred, two hundred years before singularity. We are living close to the singularity.

Some questions concerning what is Russia in that. Russia, we should not mistake. Russia is conservative society that tries to delay the process described before. Russia is not alternative (present day Russia). It is a kind of, trying to stop or delay the movement in one way, in that way, that is anti-acceleration power. We say 'not so quickly.' Our society, our president, our government says 'Not so quickly. The direction is good but not now.' That is purely conservatism. That is not proposition to restore Apollonian Logos. That is pure inertia. 'Not yet. Not now. That's all right, quite right. But not so quickly. Let us die calmly.' That is a kind of purely irresponsible, but very sane as instinct reaction against postmodernity. But the most radical formulation of Russian Logos today in modern Russian Federation, is very shy defense of reality. The best and bravest in Russia pretend to defend reality against virtuality. They are materialists absolutely, and some modernists absolutely. But they don't want to make the last step in that direction. There is strong traditionalist feeling in the people, there is in our Church a radical group that protests against the status quo, basing on Mount Athos, basing on the Elders Tradition, but that is absolutely marginal minority that has no influence on the society. They are considered to be completely crazy. Because our society is archeo-modern, It is modernist in the old sense, It cannot and doesn't want to accept post-modernity but no will, no desire, no capacity, no thought to return or to go to the pre-modern Logos. That is bad news, I presume, because it seems quite different from outside. From outside, Russia is conservative revolutionary power that fights against the West, against all that. It's not so! Maybe we should not stress too much at this point, but Russia, that is the great possibility because our Dasein and our people is bearer of this Katechonical mission. And we could see that in the reaction of the people. We have Russian Dasein. Russian Dasein is based on the Dionysian much more than the Apollonian Logos, but it is imprisoned. Our identity is imprisoned. This imprisonment is not only the Liberalism of '90s, as well as Communist period of Cybelian domination. But that was as well the late Romanovs Tsardom that was Modernist, Archeo-Modern, pro-western and so on.

So, Russia is in trouble; its Logos, its people, its Dasein, its existential horizon. But 'nothing is lost when there is something that is not lost,' as Curzio Malaparte has said. So I think that we are in a situation that is structurally close to the situation of Serbian people. We have different scale, different power, different space, different number of population, but the problem is the same. And Russia could not be regarded as the answer or alternative to what is going on. It is only the other place where the Noomahia still continues, with domination of the Cybelian Logos. So we are inside of Cybele. We are not outside of Cybele. That maybe was remarked by Milos Crnjanski in his final result of his book, that Russia is good but that is not the answer for Serbian quest for identity. Milos Crnjanski's result or summary is a tragic one because Serbs become kind of in exile, in permanent exile, with no motherland left for them. But all the hopes on Russia should be measured with this pessimistic but very open solution of Milos Crnjanski

because he loved Russia, and Serbians love Russia. And that is good, but when we have too much incorrect expectations, we could miss the question and unity in fight with something that already accomplished and perfect. So that is very important to Serbs and to all the fighters of identity to know that Russia fights. Russia is not yet defeated formally, because our people is, because it exists. But we have so great problem with Russian Logos, we could not yet start to continue the situation when our effort to create Russian philosophy was cut drastically by Communists. So we are outside of the place where really philosophy begins. We are outside. And this place is not attained, not reached yet. We are fighting to go to this moment. And because of great damage we had during last hundred years, we could not restart the process. In Russia today, there is pure social madness. We could not speak with nobody. As people, we are very good and open and very Christian, but as a kind of bearer of some intellectual ero. With so big people, so few people capable concretely to think, it is unimaginable. That is a kind of deep, dogmatical sleep (not dogmatical in the positive sense, it's adogmatical), modern, post-modern sleep, conservative sleep of the people. So we are sleeping but that is good thing that we could be awake, lets hope.

If we go to the next moment, what is the problem of the post-modernity? The post-modernity is the problem of Dionysus, because we could not appeal to the Logos of Apollo directly, because it is out of reach of our understanding. That has disappeared long, long ago, as such with the end of Middle Ages, maybe earlier. We have only the figure of Dionysus that is the sun inside of the night. So that is hidden intellect. That is hidden Logos. Being in the Hell, but not being the Hell, being inside of the night, but not belonging to the night, being inside of the world of Cybele but not being the part of function of the world of Cybele. I'm calling that in completely other type of philosophical direction, the radical subject. Radical subject is the subject that is in the center of the night, not being the night. But there is the problem of the black double of Dionysus. Because there is something Titanic that imitates Dionysus and that is his mirror or his double, as Adonis (the black double of Dionysus). And the problem is how to make distinction of them. That is the problem of simulacrum and in the religious sense, the problem of Anti-Christ, because Anti-Christ is not scarlet woman herself. It is not Cybele. It is a creation going from the abyss. And it pretends to be Christ. So the problem of Anti-Christ, or the problem of simulacrum, or the problem of double of Dionysus is the center problem of post-modernity because it pretends to be radical subject. It pretends to be this figure of Dionysus in the center of that. And that is not Christ. Radical subject is not Christ. Christ is heavenly God and man as well. But that is something that is quite different and Dionysus is the figure that is really problematic. And I gave the name for one of my books 'Radical Subject and its Double.' So that is the problem of Dionysus in other words. So we need to find this point that is in the night and doesn't belong to the night. And we shouldn't mistake it for its parody that exists close to it. So that is metaphysical explanation of Noology or Noomahia in 21st century. And I think that is the deepest analysis that could be given to the situation.

To finish this course of lectures, we could ask ourselves where the place of Serbia is in this last moment of Noomahia. That is open question and we could not answer it abstractly. So it is up to Serbian people

to decide this place. It is very important to define the noological space to make this analysis, to carefully identify the main figures, main tendencies. But that depends on the decision. And what is important is that decision is possible always up to the moment when the singularity comes. So we have very limited time for decision. Having Dasein, Dasein, being there, it is always open possibility to decide in one or the other direction. So the choice is possible when there is human. Human is there when Dasein is. But I think if we will be irreversibly replaced by artificial intelligence and devoided of our deaths, (the condition of existence, of Dasein, according to Heidegger) we will seize to be what we are. And we will lose, irreversibly, the possibility of a decision. Now we have a small amount of time in front of us because something that is approaching is more terrible and horrible than the death or torture or catastrophe, much more terrible. It is the end of the human Dasein as we know, as the result of the not correctly taken decision. According to Heidegger, European Dasein, Western Dasein has decided not to be. And that is the definition of the modernity and post-modernity. It has decided not to be and not to awake in the night, in the middle of the night, where we are. That is why he said 'Only God could save us' in the last interview, because decision was wrong and was already taken. Multiplicity of Dasein that is based on Noomahia preserves the possibility to decide otherwise. If the West has decided, I think that this kind of decision not to exist was taken for us, for Serbs, and for Russians, by the other. That was not our decision. And we didn't decide finally. So we should do it. We have time, very small amount of time to make this decision. And that is the end of the ten lectures of the Noomahia as introductory course for this study.

video: <https://www.geopolitica.ru/en/studio/introduction-noomahia-10-noomahia-x...>

THE INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE FOR PHILOSOPHY, GOVERNMENT, AND SOCIAL THOUGHT	
2012 2Contents	3
The Structure of the Debate The Debaters	4
F I R S T SE G M E N	
Tolavo de Carvalho's Answer Aleksandr Dugin's Answer: Global Transition and Its	
Enemies	25
S E C O N D SE G M E N	
Aleksandr Dugin's Reply: The West Against the	
Rest Olavo de Carvalho's Reply	67
T H I R D SE G M E N	
Aleksandr Dugin's	
Response Olavo de Carvalho's Response	143
F O U R T H SE G M E N	
Tolavo de	
Carvalho's Closing Remarks Aleksandr Dugin's Closing Remarks: Against the Post-	
Modern World	

On “White Nationalism” and other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

On “White Nationalism” and other Potential Allies in the Global Revolution

The following text was compiled from various informal statements that Prof. Dugin posted to his Facebook page over the last year which deal with common themes. I have combined and restructured them in an attempt to reshape them into a single, coherent text, and also brushed up the language somewhat.-Ed.

There are different tendencies in the new generation of revolutionary, non-conformist movements in Europe (on the Right as well as the Left), and some of them have been successful in attaining high political positions in their respective countries. The crisis of the West will grow broader and deeper every day, so we should expect an increase in the power and influence of our own Eurasianist resistance movement against the present global order, which is a dictatorship by the worst elements of the Western societies.

Those from either the Right or the Left who refuse American hegemony, ultra-liberalism, strategic Atlanticism, the domination of oligarchic and cosmopolitan financial elites, individualistic anthropology and the ideology of human rights, as well as typically Western racism in all spheres – economic, cultural, ethical, moral, biological and so on – and who are ready to cooperate with Eurasian forces in defending multipolarity, socio-economic pluralism, and a dialogue among civilizations, we consider to be allies and friends.

Those on the Right who support the United States, White racism against the Third World, who are anti-socialist and pro-liberal, and who are willing to collaborate with the Atlanticists; as well as those on the Left who attack Tradition, the organic values of religion and the family, and who promote other types of social deviations – both of these are in the camp of foe.

In order to win against our common enemy, we need to overcome the ancient hatreds between our peoples, as well as those between the obsolete political ideologies that still divide us. We can resolve such problems amongst ourselves after our victory.

At the present time, we are ALL being challenged, and ALL of us are being dominated by the forces of the prevailing global order.

Before we concern ourselves with these other issues, we first need to liberate ourselves.

I am very happy that Gábor Vona, whom I have met, and who is the leader of the Jobbik party in Hungary, understands this perfectly. We need to be united in creating a common Eurasian Front.

In Greece, our partners could eventually be Leftists from SYRIZA, which refuses Atlanticism, liberalism and the domination of the forces of global finance. As far as I know, SYRIZA is anti-capitalist and it is critical of the global oligarchy that has victimized Greece and Cyprus. The case of SYRIZA is interesting because of its far-Left attitude toward the liberal global system. It is a good sign that such non-conformist forces have appeared on the scene. Dimitris Konstantakopoulos writes excellent articles and his strategic analysis I find very correct and profound in many cases.

There are also many other groups and movements with whom we can work. The case of the Golden Dawn (Chrysi Avgi) is interesting because it is part of the growing (and very exciting indeed) reappearance of radical Right parties in the European political landscape. We need to collaborate with all forces, Right or Left, who share our principles.

The most important factor should not be whether these groups are pro-Russian or not. What they oppose is of much greater importance here. The enemy of my enemy is my friend. It is simple and easy to understand. If we adopt such an attitude in order to appeal to all possible allies (who either approve of us or who do not), more and more people will follow suit – if only due to pragmatism. In doing so, we will create a real, functioning network – a kind of Global Revolutionary Alliance. It is important that we pursue a strategy of uniting the Left and the Right everywhere, including in the United States. We need to save America from its own dictatorship, which is as bad for the American people as it is for all other peoples.

The issue of limited or unlimited government is, as far as I can see, of lesser importance in comparison with geopolitics – it all depends on the historical tradition of the nation in question. Gun ownership is a good thing when the guns are in our hands. Therefore, these two points when taken as a political platform I consider to be absolutely neutral in themselves. Such an American Right can be good or bad,

depending on other factors beyond these two points. We need to have a dialogue with those who look deeper into the nature of things, into history and who try to understand the present world order.

I consider the "White nationalists" allies when they refuse modernity, the global oligarchy and liberal-capitalism, in other words everything that is killing all ethnic cultures and traditions. The modern political order is essentially globalist and based entirely on the primacy of individual identity in opposition to community. It is the worst order that has ever existed and it should be totally destroyed. When "White nationalists" reaffirm Tradition and the ancient culture of the European peoples, they are right. But when they attack immigrants, Muslims or the nationalists of other countries based on historical conflicts; or when they defend the United States, Atlanticism, liberalism or modernity; or when they consider the White race (the one which produced modernity in its essential features) as being the highest and other races as inferior, I disagree with them completely.

More than this, I can't defend Whites when they are in opposition to non-Whites because, being White and Indo-European myself, I recognize the differences of other ethnic groups as being a natural thing, and do not believe in any hierarchy among peoples, because there is not and cannot be any common, universal measure by which to measure and compare the various forms of ethnic societies or their value systems. I am proud to be Russian exactly as Americans, Africans, Arabs or Chinese are proud to be what they are. It is our right and our dignity to affirm our identity, not in opposition to each other but such as it is: without resentment against others or feelings of self-pity.

I can't defend the concept of the nation, because the idea of the "nation" is a bourgeois concept concocted as a part of modernity in order to destroy traditional societies (empires) and religions, and to replace them with artificial pseudo-communities based on the notion of individualism. All of that is wrong. The concept of the nation is now being destroyed by the same forces that created it, back during the first stage of modernity. The nations have already fulfilled their mission of destroying any organic and spiritual identity, and now the capitalists are liquidating the instrument they used to achieve this in favor of direct globalization. We need to attack capitalism as the absolute enemy which was responsible for the creation of the nation as a simulacrum of traditional society, and which was also responsible for its destruction. The reasons behind the present catastrophe lie deep in the ideological and philosophical basis of the modern world. In the beginning, modernity was White and national; in the end, it has become global. So White nationalists need to choose which camp they want to be in: that of Tradition, which includes their own Indo-European tradition, or that of modernity. Atlanticism, liberalism, and individualism are all forms of absolute evil for the Indo-European identity, since they are incompatible with it.

In his review of my book *The Fourth Political Theory*, Michael O'Meara criticized it on the grounds of advocating a return to the unrealized possibilities of the Third Political Theory. It is good that people from different camps present their responses to the Fourth Political Theory, but it uses typically old Right/Third Way racist/anti-Semitic arguments. It is not too profound, nor too hollow. I doubt that we can get anywhere by repeating the same agenda of Yockey and so on. This draws the line between the Third Way and the Fourth Way. At the same time, I consider Heidegger to be a precursor of the Fourth Political Theory, and he was acting and thinking in the context of the Third Political Theory.

Concerning the "identitarians," I have never uttered the name of Faye in all of my writing – he is not bad, but also not good. I consider Alain de Benoist to be brilliant – simply the best. Those "identitarians" who view the positive attitude toward Islam or Turks as a negative aspect of the Fourth Political Theory do so, I believe, partly due to the manipulation of globalist forces who seek to divide those revolutionary forces which are capable of challenging the liberal-capitalist Atlanticist hegemony.

Muslims form a part of the Russian population, and are an important minority. Therefore, Islamophobia implicitly calls for the break-up of Russia. The difference between Europe and Russia in our attitude toward Islam is that, for us, Muslims are an organic part of the whole, while for Europe they are a post-colonial wave of re-invaders from a different geopolitical and cultural space. But since we have a common enemy in the globalist elite, which is pro-Pussy Riot/Femen, pro-gay marriage, anti-Putin, anti-Iran, anti-Chávez, anti-social justice and so on, we all need to develop a common strategy with the Muslims. Our traditions are quite different, but the anti-traditional world that is attacking us is united, and so must we become.

If "identitarians" really love their identity, they should ally themselves with the Eurasianists, alongside the traditionalists and the enemies of capitalism belonging to any people, religion, culture or political camp. Being anti-Communist, anti-Muslim, anti-Eastern, pro-American or Atlanticist today means to belong to the other side. It means to be on the side of the current global order and its financial oligarchy. But that is illogical, because the globalists are in the process of destroying any identity except for that of the individual, and to forge an alliance with them therefore means to betray the essence of one's cultural identity.

The problem with the Left is different. It is good when it opposes the capitalist order, but it lacks a spiritual dimension. The Left usually represents itself as an alternative path to modernization, and in doing so it also opposes organic values, traditions and religion, just as liberalism does.

I would be happy to see Left-wing identitarians who defend social justice while attacking capitalism on one hand, and who embrace spiritual Tradition and attack modernity on the other. There is only one enemy: the global, liberal capitalist order supported by North American hegemony (which is also directed against the genuine American identity).

In terms of traditionalism, usually traditionalism is defensive or is considered to be such. What we need is to break this assumption and promote offensive traditionalism. We should attack (hyper)modernity and make the status quo explode, in the name of the Return. I mean “offensive” in all ways. We need to insist.

Politics is the instrument of modernity. I think neo-Gramscism is an important tool. We have to form a historic bloc of traditionalists alongside organic intellectuals of a new type. We have Orthodox Christians (and perhaps other types of Christians as well), Muslims, Buddhists, and Hindus who all reject the idea of the “Lockean heartland” (as per Kees van der Pijl) becoming global. We need attack it together, not by ourselves. And we need to attack in any possible way – everyone as he or she is able – physically, politically, and intellectually...

It is time to be offensive.

Soon the world will descend into chaos. The financial system is going to collapse. Disorder, ethnic and social conflicts will be breaking out everywhere. Europe is doomed. Asia is in tumult. The oceans of immigrants everywhere will overthrow the existing order. The present system will be broken and disbanded.

After this transitional period, direct global dictatorship will be implemented. We should be prepared and start to organize the global resistance right now – the planetary network of traditionalists, Conservative Revolutionaries, Heideggerians, the partisans of the Fourth Political Theory and multipolarity, and non-conformists of all sorts – a kind of Sacred Front beyond Right and Left, and consisting of different, older political and ideological taxonomies. All three of the political theories have been phased out of modernity, and also out of conventional and assumed history. We, and also our enemies, are entering absolutely new ground.

Every traditionalist should ask himself (or herself) the following questions:

1. Why have I arrived to be on the side of Tradition in opposition to modernity?
2. What is the reality that makes me what I am, in essence? Where have I got it from?
3. Is my vocation as a traditionalist the result of my socio-cultural heritage (society, family, and culture) or is it the result of some other factor?
4. How it is possible, in the midst of modernity and postmodernity, to be differentiated from them?
5. In which way can I cause the modern world around me real damage? (In other words, how can I effectively fight against the Devil?)

The Fourth Political Theory struggles for the cause of all peoples, but it is not made for the people. It is a call to the intellectual elite of every human society, and rejects hegemony in all senses (philosophical, social, and political). This time, the people cannot help us. This time, we must help the people.

Opposing us is nothing more than an intellectual elite, but it is a hegemonic one. All its material power is nothing but an illusion and a phantasm: its texts, discourse and words are what really counts. Its force lays in its thought. And it is on the level of thought that we have to fight and, finally, win. Everything material that opposes us is actually nothing but pure privation. Only thought really exists.

It is easy to manipulate the masses, much easier than to persuade the few. Quantity is the enemy of quality – the more so, the worse. The capitalist elite thinks differently. That error will be fatal. For them. And we are going to prove it.

We need an open, undogmatic Front that is beyond Right and Left.

We have prepared for the coming moment of opportunity for too long. But now, finally, it is not so far in the future.

We will change the course of history. At present, it is on a very wrong course.

We can only win if we combine our efforts.

4pt

USA

Ontology and anthropology of theater Lecture 1. Introduction to course

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Preliminary remarks

Today we are starting a course called “Ontology and Anthropology of the theater”. This course will be divided into three parts. We’ll talk about these three parts today, about each of them, one third of the time allotted to us, approximately corresponding to an academic double class.

First part (Ontology of theater): short description

In the beginning we will talk about the ontology of the theater. Ontology is the study of being. So, in the ontology of the theater, we will consider how the theater relates to such a major philosophical category as being. That is, if Martin Heidegger’s main work is “Sein und Zeit”: Sein – being and Zeit – time, “Being and time”. This is the main philosophical work of the XX century and perhaps one of the most important in the whole history of philosophy. Our course is dedicated to “Sein und Theater”, that is “Being and Theater”. So, theater will be for us the same problematical category as “being” for Heidegger. I would ask you in this regard to be rather concentrated, because the very concept of the course or the theme “Ontology of the theater” is not so clear, but we will comprehend the dark by something even darker – obscurus per obscurum – this is how any hermeneutics act, because, according to Schleiermacher and Dilthey, we cannot know the whole, therefore we cannot study parts; we cannot know the parts until we know the whole. We have only one thing left: to study the whole and the parts in parallel, going round in circles around the considered problem.

The same thing with being. We can walk around it and try to discover the ontology, that is, the study of being, and every time we say: “This is being, here it is – the Being, that’s being, this is, and this is not”, we are always talking about something particular, as if we understood what “is” means. If we start conversely: “There is pure being, everything has come out of it” - it also seems to us there, as if we understand what “pure being” is, although we deal only with parts. Accordingly, being is a problem. And in the ontology of the theater we will touch upon this issue. In the same way (but here is the most interesting), okay with being – it’s however philosophy, but it seems that we know what theater is. Here is the theater, the Moscow Art Theater. As Heidegger’s Dasein, this-being, this-theater – Da-theater, that is, here it is. But, in fact, this is not right. And as Dasein is problematic, so is the theater. Accordingly, what theater is – we, frankly, do not know either. It’s better to agree with me right away

that we don't know, then everything will be more interesting. Who believes that he knows exactly what theater is – well, it certainly will be necessary to dispel a persistent delusion. Therefore, admit, agree, as a hypothesis, that we do not know what theater is. At least me. We will understand this together with you.

Second part (Anthropology of theater): short description

What about anthropology? Anthropology is the study of humans. The anthropology of the theater suggests how theatrical action, theatrical practice, theatrical theory, how the theater as a whole relates to human, what role a human plays in the theater, who is the actor and how he was called in different cultures and what his place is; who is the stage director, who is the screenwriter and who is the spectator. Because if we do not yet fully know what theater is, respectively, we do not know its humanistic, human filling and its parts. This is the second part of our course.

Third part (Desacralization and resacralization of theater): short description

And the third part of our course is desacralization and resacralization of the theater. This, in essence, is about the history of the theater, which begins with sacredness, that is, with sacred cults. The theater (ancient theater) is fundamentally sacred, it develops from the mysteries (we will also talk about that, what is the mystery). Gradually, it is becoming more and more desacralized. And at the end of the course we will approach the most important problem – is it possible to return to the sacred roots of the theater? That is, is it possible to save the theater from the history of the theater, because the history of the theater moves in the opposite direction from its original meaning. That is, we have a drama, there is a kind of intrigue in this course, there is a certain detective story. Therefore, instead of the banal story about something we all know, I will try to turn this course into the opening of more and more new horizons that we will explore with you.

Today I will give a brief summary of the entire course, about all these series, so I will be very brief. I won't be able to explain, argue, give a sufficient number of examples. This is just a presentation of the course.

Part I. Ontology of theater: survey of epistemological field

θέατρον and θεωρία

Accordingly, the first part is ontology, ontology of the theater. From the very beginning, attention must be paid to etymology. Here we pronounce the word "theater", θέατρον, but since it is not native in our speech, then we immediately, I would say, rob ourselves semantically or better we are in full

equivocation. Because we use the word of another (not Russian) language, where it has a specific meaning, we can never be sure we correctly understand its original meaning.

So the word "theater", θέατρον (театр in Russian) is formed from the Greek word "θεάομαι", that is "to contemplate." Hence the concept of "sight". The most accurate Russian analogue of the concept "theater" is «зрелище[1]» (from the word «зреть», «зрение»,») because "θεάομαι" means precisely «зреть»[2], «зрение»[3], «наблюдение» [4], «со-зерцать»[5], «видение» [6]. On the one hand, and, for example, the old forgotten word «позорище»[7], that initially meant sight and theater without pejorative connotation. This old-Russian, old- Slavonic word «позорище» means now someone subjected to shameful punishment, disgrace, exhibited in the center of the city or village in sleazy appearance, tormented etc. In general, this exhibition of disgrace is closely connected with the theater, with the spectacle, with sight.

Another word that is derived from the same Greek root "θεάομαι " is " θεωρία " - that is theory. In fact, this is not just harmony, it is a unity of understanding obtained by contemplation.

Why - I will explain now. Theory ("θεωρία " in Greek) means the same contemplation, the same sight, the same spectacle. Therefore, in fact, "theory" and "theater" are very close things. In both "theater" and "theory" we contemplate so we are implementing the "θεάομαι" act - we see, we look. "Well, why," you say, "what does the theater have to do (when the actors portray something on the stage and the others laugh or cry) with a philosopher or a scientist who makes up some abstract, theoretical constructions?" It is very important to pay attention to the hierarchy of sensory organs with which the ancient Greeks dealt, with whom philosophy was born, and almost simultaneously – theater.

Namely theater and philosophy are the same age. In ancient Greece, they appear at about the same time. Full-fledged philosophy and θεωρία, as the main speculation, the main method of philosophy and – theater, θέατρον (Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides and the others -- (classical theater). This is approximately the same historical cycle.

Hierarchy of senses in Aristotle

So, "θεωρία", which is the basis of philosophy, and "contemplation" are associated with the theater. So, it is very interesting, why the highest peak of philosophy as contemplation, speculation is associated with the theater? And this, in its turn, has a very deep idea. Firstly, Aristotle said that the sense organs have a hierarchy. Thus some sensations are more noble than the others.

Those that are more noble are more relevant to being (and now we are approaching the ontology of the theater). And those that are less noble are further away from being and from substance, and more and more material.

There are 5 sensory organs (at least the Greeks mapped this way, made such assemblage if we use Deleuze's term).

The supreme sensory organ was sight. Why (from Aristotle's point of view)? Because we see lightning at first, and then we only hear the thunder. That which is seen at the longest distance, that which is seized faster, is closer to the world of the gods, swift and light.

And what we hear later, what we perceive closer to our body relates to the animal world, to stones, to vegetative and mineral roots of being. Accordingly, being in its pure, divine form is associated with vision. And the hierarchy of feelings goes like this:

1. first comes sight (according to Aristotle),
2. then there is hearing (because we hear thunder secondarily),
3. then comes the sense of smell (the smell of the sacrificial fire), by the way, the smoke of the sacrificial fire is the basis of the Greek concept of "God", "θεός." This has nothing to do with (just a consonance) with "θεάομαι", it's not about eyesight, but it's about inhaling the aroma of the sacrificial animal (θύω). "θεός" that is, God is revealed to us on the other side of the fire of fire, smoke comes from it, and God, who tastes this smoke, is there (ἐκεῖ), in open space, on the other side of the smoke, on that side that is directed to him. This is the third feeling.

4. The fourth feeling is the tactile sense. We perceive a tactile touch only when the source of this is in close proximity to us, and we can smell the smell in advance.

5. And last, the basest sense is taste. Look, you can already see how today the hierarchy is turned upside down. After all, we basically start with whether it is tasty or not, aftertaste, then tactile feeling, then smells, lotions, perfumes. And we leave for the last turn what we hear and what we see.

The ancient Greeks had the opposite order. And here a very interesting point arises: how is this hierarchy of the sensory world (and the sensual world is called “aesthetics” in Greek). What is αἴσθησις, aesthesis? These are feelings. Actually, aesthetics is a concept about the sensory world, about its organization). And so, aesthetic organization of the sensory world is built on this hierarchical vertical. And here is the most interesting. Which of these feelings, of these sense organs is more connected with being, more connected with what truly exists? Here, the hierarchy of these feelings clearly indicates that above all exists what we see. Secondly, what we hear. Thirdly - what we smell. Fourthly – what touches us. And only fifthly – what we swallow and what is inside us, inside our bodies. And this means that the taste is less than a touch, the smell is more than a touch (at the next level). Sound is even more (has more being). And the highest being is sight.

This optic reveals what θεωρία, speculation, and contemplation actually are. At root, this is the relation to being. That is, through θεωρία, through contemplation, through emphasizing our ability to see being, we come closer to its essence.

Aristotle limits his sensory world hierarchy on this; thereby he completes the review of aesthetic structures that are associated not only with aesthetics, but also with philosophy, with ontology, with gnoseology.

ἰδέα seen by Plato and Plotinus

But Plato (the teacher of Aristotle), depicts an even more complete, finally clear picture. His ideas are endowed with maximum being. Ideas are some disembodied material essences, which are examples of all things in our world – i.e. aesthetic world, corporeal, sensual world. This is the main Plato’s message – the doctrine of ideas. Ideas exist forever, they are patterns, they are projected into the world of becoming and give rise to all sorts of things that are temporary and which are subject to the law of birth and downfall, death. And ideas exist eternally.

But what does theory have to do with it? Here we turn again to etymology. For us, “idea” (ιδέα) is a word of foreign language. We never think what it means. Or think, but rarely. But in fact, an idea is a passive participle from the verb εἶδω (I see), that is, the same meaning as “θεάομαι”. That is, ideas are what we see. And that’s it.

From this it is clear that what we see exists in first place; what we hear exists less; the fact that we smell is even less; what we feel is even less; and what we feel inside (taste) exists to an even lesser extent. Here we understand how the epistemological and ontological hierarchy is built.

Ideas (according to Plato) are what is. These are not the thoughts of a person in the head, this is what always existed, exist and will exist. Thoughts come and go. Or don’t come. But anyway for Plato, ideas are not human thoughts, but what a thinking person is able to contemplate at the very peak of being. This is not an ordinary vision, but a kind of special vision. In the Eleusinian Mysteries, it is embraced by the concept of “ἐποπτεία”, another term associated with vision.

ἐποπτεία (from ἐπί – on, and ὀπτική act of seeing, from ὄψ, eye) is when the gaze drifts deep into being, at the being itself, to the divine eternal sphere of light – then a certain discovery of the very essence of what there is arises. Only through this concentrated exclusive intense vision we come into contact with being. Being and vision are inextricably linked.

Further we are talking about the hierarchy of vision. And here Plotinus helps us. Because he believes that there is correct vision, and there is incorrect vision. Correct vision is vision with closed eyes, because what to look at in this world? - This world only confuses us.

Therefore, vision is divided into profane false vision (but still more noble than other senses) and sacred true vision that occurs (with closed eyes).

What does it mean – “to see with closed eyes”? It means that our gaze should be immersed in ourselves, in our immortal soul, in our archetype, in the idea of ourselves. And in this contemplation of gaze shift (but of the gaze, and not of another sense) inward, we overcome the boundaries of corporal, aesthetic vision and go on to speculation[8], to a special form of perception of being, which is associated with speculation, with the vision of the mind, with smart vision.

And the moment of ἐποπτεία in the Eleusis mysteries is when the deity is revealed by mystes (μύστης) and neophytes (νεόφυτος) who undergo this initiation. This is the moment of ἐποπτεία, again, of vision, sight, discovery of some kind of not ordinary object, but a certain scene, situation, or phenomenon, which is fundamentally there.

In fact, the goal of philosophy is the contemplation of being. But contemplation of being in its pure form is extremely difficult, because in order to see being in its pure form, it is necessary to cross the boundaries of those spaces, those sections of reality, where being is scattered in many objects. This is the aspiration for unity. Such an internal movement to consciousness in order to see the absent, transcendental One (Ἐν) - this is the true contemplation and true goal of philosophy.

Theater and vision

How does this relate to the theater? There is a direct connection. Theater is the place where philosophical theory (θεωρία) is realized. Namely, theater, θέατρον is a place of philosophy, this is a place of contemplation. And we would hardly come to the theater (ok, as for us, we might come), but hardly the ancient Greeks would have come to the theater if they had seen there something ordinary, something banal, something trivial, that is everywhere. They came there for the sight. And the sight, the source of the sight, the meaning of the sight is the contemplation of being.

Therefore, the ancient Greeks came to the theater to contemplate being. Hence, theater is something philosophical; it is the field of speculation. And it is in this sense (later, in the Renaissance and earlier by Petronius) that we meet such definitions as "Mundus universus exercet histrioniam" (this is in Latin), i.e. the universal world, everything in the world is a game of actors. So this phrase by Petronius is translated, and then the well-known Shakespearean phrase from "The Merchant of Venice", that "all the world's a stage, and all the men and women merely players". Why is that so? Where does this metaphor come from? Why was Shakespeare's theater called the Globe? Just because it's actually a theater, any theater is a globe or "mundus". It is the World, it is the "universus". This universus, of course, would never fit into any walls if it were a physical, plural world.

This is the paradigm of the world; it is his idea of world that is embedded in the theater. Hence its sacred meaning: we bring the entirety of being into one small stage, into one limited amount of time. It is a contraction of being to its concentrated expression.

Sacredness of theater

Naturally, this requires a completely unique situation. The theater in its origins was a sacrament, the sacrament of discovering the contemplation of idea. And, accordingly, it was the Globe, it was the World, a more real one than the external world. It seems to us that theater is a reflection of life. Nothing of the kind, the theater never served as a reflection of life, of the world, it didn't never show ordinary people, and what was happening to them; the theater never was a mirror. The theater was an emanating beam of being.

The theater created and made the World. The theater put the content in life, in history, in politics, in culture. The theater is the place of cosmogony, when the small germ of the World only begins to reveal its fullness at its first stages. In other words, the theater is an absolutely philosophical phenomenon, a sacred phenomenon, where the whole Universe is reduced to this building, albeit a large one (amphitheater). The whole universe is packed into theater, and this is possible if we understand the theater as an idea (as a place of contemplating ideas, as a spectacle). That is, the ontology of the theater is that the theater is the territory of being. Not a narrative of something, but the territory of being in itself, in a condensed, concentrated form.

The theater not only helps to close our eyes and look inside ourselves, but the theater makes us look inside ourselves. Because what happens on the stage, the right plays of the right theater, it's happening inside our minds. This is our path to ourselves, to our origins. This World is pulled together into the theater and the being is gathered into our inner contemplation. Therefore, we didn't come here to look outside (this can be done without theater). We come to the theater to glance inward. This is a place of insight, a place of introspection, a collective, well-organized, but introspection.

Secret life of scenic decorations (confuse-a-cat)

Well, and accordingly, we can say that the theater reproduces the world also in the simplest, most straightforward sense. The stage on which the action is played is the earth, and the earth is not only a stand for the human, or for houses, or for pets, the earth is such a living thing, it is a deity in Greece, therefore the scene (or podium) is sacred as sacred is the land. The sky, from which the figure of the deity often descends, *deus ex machina* (in contemporary theater – and civilization -- this metaphor is largely used too literally), is actually the place of ideas, the place of the upper layers of being, to which

we rise. And the action itself takes place between heaven and earth. They are extremely important in the theater.

These are not just utility tools. Each history of the stage, decoration, organization of theatrical space behind the stage, around the stage, on stage is of tremendous importance, since it reflects the structure of the world.

But not only reflects. It reflects, looking not at the world, but looking at the origins of the world. Thus, the theatrical scenery that we see (these columns made of papier-mâché, some pictures of flat houses, with open windows) are stage-properties and we see that this is not real. Now, if we understand what theater is, we will understand that these papier-mâché columns, these artificial stones, these flat decorations are more alive than a real house.

That, in the end, a real house -- with its walls, with its huge number of workers, costs, constantly breaking pipes, with its chaos and baseness, in which there's nothing to look at -- it is created for some of the lowest bodily needs. But the theatrical sketch of the windows, this flat picture gives us a map of being. It's a *πανοῖκος* («house of all») -- the archetype of the house that is so lightly sketched here on the stage. Why do we need to see these real columns? After all, the task is not to feel them, to nibble these columns. We are not dogs (we would have another course dedicated to pets...). There is still no theater for dogs, cats (although, as I know, there are already attempts to stage such performances for animals[9]). But still we are humans, and therefore we don't come to nibble and to try theatrical scenery for strength and vividness. It is enough for us to see them. And, having seen them, we will understand the existence of the column, we will understand the existence of the window, we will understand the existence of the house, the wall, the car, the bicycle -- whatever we notice (even though it will be one gesture, one element) -- contemplating it, we see through some fractal analogue (in modern theater) the idea that stands behind it.

Therefore, this theater props are more real than the objects of our life. This is precisely what follows from the ontology of the theater that we are talking about.

Theater and topology of Hell

Another very important point is the moment of *ἐπορτεία* in the Eleusinian mysteries, the moment of the revelation of the highest sacrament, which was practically forbidden to communicate to other Greeks who passed this initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries. It happened in crypts, usually at night and in

craters. That is, in order to pass the initiation, it was necessary to go down deep into the earth, because there, away from views of the crowd, from the profans, from the day, the true ideas of being are sleeping. In fact, this descent into the earth, deep, deep into mystery, is symmetrical to the ascent(as described by Plato in «Phaedrus») of the chariot of the Gods to contemplate eternal Being beyond the bounds of heaven. This is the achievement of two polar points, two solstices, summer and winter – both of these points are the moments of entry into the mystery.

And one of the stable elements of theatrical architecture is the organization of the amphitheater on the principle of concentric descending circles. What does this resemble? Well, if we take Dante, then this obviously looks like Hell. But don't be so afraid right away. Hell is just Hades, Aides, the realm of invisible life of afterdeath. And, accordingly, the theater, the theater hall imitates the dedicatory space of the descent into the territory of the Mysteries, that is, the descent to the center of Hell. The scene, the actor, the action – the objects of our contemplation, "θεάομαι", "θέατρον" – belong to the center of Hell. It is to it, to the center of Hell, that the fullness of being is gathered together. And, accordingly, if we look at the architecture itself (the Moscow Art Theater or any other theater), we will see these concentric circles, which gradually, gradually come down.

Therefore, in fact, the sites in parterre are not the best places, the best sites are the lodge (i.e still a little higher). Parterre is a certain bottom of Hell. Accordingly, the gallery is much more attractive, it was there that the royal lodges or Politbureau members loges were organized (as in the Moscow Art Theater there is a remarkable historical place where Brezhnev was sitting, not in the parterre, but in the lodge). And the kings and noble people also sat in the box. This is a descent, there is a good view but still a certain distance from the center of Hell remains.

Theater – place where people is born

So, if we talk about the ontology of the theater – what we come to is that in the first part of our course we will successively examine and disassemble this connection between theater and being. Accordingly, we can speak in detail about, let's say, the ontology of scenery, the ontology of the stage, theatrical architecture, the spectacle itself, in other words, about the varieties and structures of contemplation. People who go to the theater come for initiation into the mystery. It may not be the mystery itself, but it is some analogue of it, an indirect analogue.

Perhaps one can imagine that the theater was a preparatory part for the mystery. If you went to Greece (Ancient Greece), you may have noticed the following pattern (even if we consider Delphi and other sacred places): there are often sanctuary, theater and stadium. And they were built, as a rule, together in the structure of unified complex. The sacred temple for sacrifices, the theater and the stadium - were the three elements where Greece was created, where Greek philosophy was created, where all the citizens, real, aristocratic citizens of the Greek Polis, came to be a people.

In the theater, as well as in the temple, as well as at the stadium, was created the people. The Greeks from individuals, from householders, from representatives of some classes and professions, coming to the theater turned into something united. In fact, it was a place of affirmation of a collective entity. The Greek Polis was born in the theater. Later [10], Voltaire said that a "nation is born in parterre". But there was almost no parterre in the Greek theaters (the parterre is a certain horizontal), but the Greek πόλις – Greek people were born in these theaters, as in the amphitheater. This is the matrix of the birth of the people, the πόλις, the unity, which, contemplating the sacrament, contemplating the being, becomes what it is.

Hence the great importance of the theater in terms of simply endowing the people with its content. It didn't reflect anything. It communicated that which in everyday life, none of the Greek inhabitants of the πόλις knew, didn't see, didn't meet. The theater tells us not just what there is, but what there is in the highest sense, what must be, what is in secret, what really exists. Namely, philosophy according to Heidegger is the search for truth. And the truth is "αλήθεια" (in Greek), that is, something "not hidden". In ordinary life, the truth is hidden for us, we forget about it. We come to the theater for the truth, for "αλήθεια". In order to remember everything that was forgotten or that we did not know at all. Our earthly life is but a short delay between two immense eternal amounts of time – but we know nothing about them. Let us take into account the Platonic idea that souls exist before birth, and then we forgot all about it, because at the moment of incarnation the soul drinks a cup of oblivion. The theater reminds us that we forgot at birth or never knew in life. That which we do not encounter.

The theater creates the world, creates the people. It does not reflect, does not represent. It is very important.

To see is to create (and to be seen)

This is also associated with the ophthalmological theory of philosophy, because there are two conceptions about vision in Greece. The first is that our eye reflects the outside world (just reflects, is a mirror), as they think today, but Plato believed that it was not at all -- our eye is what creates visible space. Our eye emits rays. And in this regard, it does not see what is outside, but it creates within its act

of vision this reality; that is philosophical vision that pierces the thickness of the multitude and sees unity beyond its borders. Therefore, in fact, on the one hand, we come to the theater to see, that is, to contemplate, but on the other hand, we come to the theater to be seen, wishing that eye, that vision, those ideas that are presented, performed on the stage, as in the center of the world, in the center of a mysterious crypt, to get sight of us.

Therefore, in fact, the question of who is the actor here, who is the spectator (pay attention to it), the contemplating spectator, the speculator, that is, which of us is an actor, and who is the spectator, is still to be proved, because the very idea that being and sight, appearance are one and the same thing, immediately and abruptly places us in a completely different phenomenology.

Part II. Anthropology of theater: survey of epistemological field

Chorus at the origin of anthropology of theater

Now we move on to the second topic: theater, part two. Here I will say two words about the history of the theater.

We know that the individual actor (ὑποκριτής in Greek, *histrion* in Latin) did not appear from the very start. In the beginning there was a chorus, *χορός* on the stage. The choruses partially expressed what was happening with chants, dances, gesture (*le gestuel* in French), body language, communicated some information to us with different poses, and, on the other hand, for the most part, they sang about what they wanted to tell us.

The chorus is the source of histrionic being. The anthropology of the theater takes its source also from the chorus. A chorus that is not partitioned (very important); yet non-divided into different figures of actors chorus; the chorus itself. Why was this so important? Because the general precedes the individual in classical concept of very nature of man.

A chorus sings in unison, as a rule, or two choruses, if you take satire (i.e. comedy), representing usually angelic, divine or demonic creatures. These creatures tell the audience about what? About gods and heroes.

τράγος and κῶμος

Speaking of gods and heroes, either in a serious, tragic form, as in a tragedy, or in a mocking form, as in a comedy. Both have a direct relationship with the cult of Dionysus, because the “song of the goat” – τράγος is he-goat, ᾠδή – chant -- is considered to be original meaning of the very name “tragedy”, τραγωδία, the goat personified the god Dionysus who was victimized. κῶμος, from which the word “comedy” (κωμωδία – where we encounter once more ᾠδή – chant) came from, was a group of winy, drunken men who came from the Dionysian processions. And, very interestingly, the κῶμος always embodied satyrs who were already drunk enough for not being afraid, not to observe any regulations, and in fact, they behaved ugly: they allowed themselves dirty jokes, molested women, broke things, demanded more wine, but, unlike ordinary drunkards (those unpleasant who were called “шпана” (hooligans) in Soviet times, I don’t know how they are called now), the κῶμος was such drunken fellows, accompanied by the god Dionysus himself.

Imagine, there is a group of people who, if deprived of this divinity, this sacredness, will most likely cause disgust, fear, because their actions are unpredictable, they are chaotic, malicious, excited, completely uncontrollable. But in this κῶμος, besides the dark side, there was also a divine side, because among them, under the guise of the same drunk young man or old man, god himself was walking. This presence of god in the κῶμος transformed the meaning of comedy, the sense of the κῶμος itself. In fact, the meaning of comedy is a very subtle, divine irony that does not mock or stigmatize social sins or different kinds of injustices. Real comedy is the highest art of staying on the edge, being exactly between the wild outburst of animal passions, the infernal impulse, powerfully transmitted outside, and the extremely divine refinement, which preserves measure in everything, because the difference between god and titan is that god does not have ὕβρις (another important term). ὕβρις is a sin of the titans. ὕβρις is the lack of tact. The titans have no tact. If they start tossing stones, they can’t stop until they make havoc of everything. If someone is attacked, then they bite, spit, and when they plunge their opponent, they begin to scoff at him or boil him (as Dionysus was boiled) in a cauldron to tear him asunder. Homer describes ὕβρις as an outrage upon the body, the corpse of a dead enemy. While the warrior is fighting another warrior, he naturally feels the rage, he hates him, he wants to tear him apart. But when he fell – at that moment it is the divine principle in man that says: “Stop. Here we draw the line. I won’t spit upon him, I won’t cut off any parts from him, I won’t tear his family on his grave (as many Achaeans did after the capture of Troy, possessed not by the divine spirit, but by the spirit of

titanism)". But the divine principle says: "Stop. You won. The fight is over. That's all". There is divine part in warrior that prevails now.

In the Irish epic about Cuchulainn, the hero of the Irish epos, Cuchulainn was so inflamed in battle that it was impossible to stop him, he was transformed from a divine hero into a titan. There were a number of examples, some of them indecent, because they immediately showed a huge number of naked girls who were supposed to make him stop; and secondly, put him into a cold barrel - in any case, they returned his divine being which completely turned into war, to certain borders in different ways, cut off his ὕβρις.

So, as for the κῶμος. κῶμος is a group of Dionysus followers who do not go beyond limits, do not fall into ὕβρις. This is a very fine line.

Accordingly, the choruses depicted in different types of ancient theatrical performances exactly the beings of another world. Practically, these divine or semi-divine heroic beings meant the ideas themselves.

Falling form chorus: luceferic nature of individual actor

Choruses - this is the world of the ideas-stars, these are some bright flashes that enlighten us, spectators, as people who came to the theater for initiation; these choruses tell us the main thing -- why we are sitting in the theater, not sneezing, not fidgeting; even today, when the theater has lost its sacred background for many centuries, we are still somehow respectful, we are already so boorish in ordinary life that it's almost a feat for us to sit down and watch a play. But we still freeze in the theater because of momentum. These are the consequences of how performances were watched earlier, how to properly behave toward the theater. What happens there and what the choruses tell us as otherworldly creatures is, in fact, completely unique information, we need to catch every moment, every gesture, we need to remember, because choruses are the ideas that constitute due order in us. The choruses themselves (this source of histrionics, the source of anthropology: the actor is born from the chorus, the chorus is primary, you can talk a lot about what the very concept of "chorus", "χορός" is a circle, round dance, circle of stars, of planetary orbits), which sing – it is the voice of the stellar world, these are ideas that tell us about the structure of being.

In fact, histrionic choruses are some kind of alphabet of gods, which they are themselves; each of them is a certain letter, and all these letters, all these different levels of singing, their voices create the most

important for us choral narrative of gods and heroes, which is not a narrative of something that once passed, but about what always is.

Therefore, in the theater, the laws of time are repealed. The structure of the ordinary perception of the world is completely changing, because what the chorus is talking about is really important. And it is from the chorus that actors are born.

Of course, many exploited the fact that one of the Greek actors, Thespis, did when he once stepped forth out of the chorus (Aristotle wrote about this) and began to proclaim the words of a god or hero on his own. This is how, the modernists / individualists say, our theater was born (because it used to be choruses, and then an actor came forward and said: "I'll now sing solo, individually the goat's song.")

But to what extent was it reasonable or to what extent is was progress (or regress) I wouldn't make my own judgment. Simply, if we trust the origins of the sacred theater, I would still focus in the collective or better "choristic" anthropology of the theater (in order to understand the essence of the actor) -- not on that guy who stepped forth, but on those choruses, that didn't break the old order, the eternal order. If a star leaves its place and begins to think too much about itself... Do you know what it's called?

It's Lucifer. It's the morning and evening star, which finds itself in a special situation. So when someone leaves the chorus, this means that one of the highest spiritual essences that had to stay in its place breaks away from this reality.

This first actor puffed out his pride too much. And here, of course, we can already say that he wanted to become a vessel of god himself. Well done, this is the right choice, the correct one, but quite responsible. Could he endure this deity for long? Let's remind κῶμος again - a group of drunken men returning from the festival of Dionysus. Yes, when they are numerous and they are affected by the procession of Dionysus - they can endure the presence of God, but whether you stay alone with him, without the rest of the men who make jokes, who splash out this wild, frenzied aggression of the deity that walks around them... Tête-à-tête - it is very dangerous. So, I do not want neither to glorify nor to curse that first actor, the first of the actors who came out of the chorus. But I want to emphasize that it was a very responsible performance. That in fact, the chorus itself is already so cool, it's so fundamental to be part of this cast in which the divine meets the human, the sky touches the earth and tells the audience the highest secret of being, that it's already the top (can it be higher?). But someone got a craving to perform an aria solo, and from this begins a certain transformation of the theater anthropology.

Bliss and damnation to be actor

We can say that this is the beginning of modernity in the theater, because what we are talking about when we deal with its anthropology which descends to choruses and masks (the masks are identical, it's very important), masks hide the actor, hide the personality; they just portray the stars. After all, do we distinguish so clearly, with simple sight, the faces of the stars? We say: this is one, this is another, but mostly when they interrelate. It is unlikely that, if somebody showed us, took photo-portraits of stars, we would be able to distinguish them.

But in this absence of difference (maybe Mars is a little red, but this is for specialists). Angels resemble each other.

When they are described, they usually look the same (like the devils as well). They are very, very symmetrical, they have no individual features. Choruses are composed of Angels. Church singers who stand in choirs arise from that ancient theater. Chorus is the origin of proper actors.

People appearing on stage in the theater, must forget who they were until the moment they entered the stage. Here they are a chorus, here they are angels, stars and demons. And their task is to completely forget about themselves and tell the spectators about something fundamentally important. It is like playing the role of ideas. Therefore, the theater is a sight.

But this spectacle is by no means a narrative of what we see outside, this is a narrative of what we do not see outside, but we should have to see. And therefore, choruses are actually more primary than people, in a sense. A person from the chorus or an actor, as part of it – precedes the man. In the beginning were stars (according to Plato), and only after -- humans. At first there were souls, and only after bodies. At first it was eternity, and time come after.

And now the actors from the choirs are going in a different direction. They say this: "We are humans, we are temporary, we are bodily, but here we are not any more who we were. On this stage we are not humans, we are not temporary, we are not bodily." An actor who enters the choir gets the new status. He actually becomes a certain medium, a prophet, an obsessed one. And it is the very power of this obsession, its seriousness that does not allow us, holds us back from taking a step forward.

This is a very risky step out of the choir and the solo performance of someone's aria. Very risky. And the risk of this Thespis, who took the first step, is still challenging. We still do not really know whether he did the right thing or not. Was this a heroic action of a true believer or the beginning of decadence of the theater - we do not know. I just draw attention to how fundamental the actor's mission is. An actor, generally speaking, is one who should not be human, cease to be human, become an idea. Not forever (unlike a saint, philosophers who go the same way, but forever). And the actor actually agrees to be there only temporarily, to be in a choir.

But even this changes human nature so much that it becomes the supreme bliss.

Therefore, in fact, acting is a thing that breaks a person up. Of course, an actor is not adapted to life and is useless in life -- a loser, as a rule. It's hard to imagine happy actors, they would hardly be good actors. The actor agrees to neglect his personal life, his everyday existence.

But the moment when he plays, the moment when he is part of the choir, the moment when he is an idea - it more than covers his other purely human sufferings, shortcomings. And this is really a huge price, much more than a person pays for becoming an actor. If we understand what anthropology of the theatre is.

Actor of theater as source of social understanding of man

Here is another point. We now turn to Thespis, an actor who took a step forward and who became known as an actor, not a choir. We come to a more individual theater, where individual characters play the roles of gods, heroes, individual historical figures. They are called actors ὑποκριτής (hypocrites). Hypocrites in Greek means a person who is a hypocrite, a dissembler. A hypocrite is an actor. The hypocrite, in this case, is the one who portrays something that doesn't exist. The actor is the same hypocrite, the same dissembler, the same ὑποκριτής.

Another interesting name for an actor (in a Latin context) is "persona". That is, what we call "personality." Those who are not familiar with sociology, may ask: "Well, then, the personality is ourselves?" In fact, a person (in sociology or philosophy) is not ourselves. A person is who we portray (but in life).

This is what we are in the eyes of society, and not what we are in our own eyes, if we are able to look at ourselves in a way different than they are looking at us from the outside.

Therefore, the “person”, our idea of personality is not something that is personified and portrayed in the theater, but that, on the contrary, is copied from the actor. And once again, we can notice a unique thing: at first the actor appears as a person (Greek πρόσωπον – face). Florensky[11] had the idea that there is

1. the divine image, лик (in Slavonic they apply лик to the images of Christ and Saints);
2. and a human face, person in Latin, лицо in Russian juridical use – юридическое лицо;
3. a guise as a corporal mask, личина.

Etymologically (it is a beautiful image and very helpful, this kind of division) – in fact, the all three words had the same origin and go back to proto-germanic root *laikaz and further to indo-european *leyg- with the wonderful meaning – to chant, to dance, to make rounds and leaps. So it remount to something akin to chorus! So maybe in these Russian words original sense is directly connected to theater...

The person is who we are not. Here you can recall the choruses. The face is just part of the choir. This is what a face and what a person is. So, a person is a certain figure appearing from the choir, representing someone other than himself. Hence the hypocrites. Hence the notion of hypocrisy and the connection of the concept of hypocrisy with the concept of “acting, dissembling”. Everything is connected around the person. A person is a mask, guise. In essence, the meaning of the person (to have face) is the meaning of the guise. Not the individual identity is primary in the determination of personality, but the mask. A person is guiseness. We are personalities to the extent that we hide our “self”, to the extent that we hide behind a mask, to the extent that we join the choir, to the extent that we are (just) actors.

But personality is the basic concept of jurisprudence, sociology, philosophy, and politics. They speak about humiliation of human dignity, aggression against personality, violation of individual rights. And here a very interesting point: wow, it turns out that the basic concept of the human language «persona» on which legal systems, political models, courts, economic systems are built; personality – is the basic definition of the entire socio-legal, socio-political structure - it turns out to be a superstructure grounded on the concept of "actor". So the society as such is built on the stage of the theater...

So, the actor is primordial, the actor is the very personality. "Personality" is the one who hides his being behind a mask. That's what a "personality" is. This is one who carries with him a guise. That's why we are talking about personality as a social phenomenon.

Personality is a father, husband, student, policeman. Personality is a kind of totality of our roles. And it is no coincidence that sociology is based on the metaphor of theater. But not only sociology does apply theater to its models, but also did politics, law and other social disciplines in their origins.

The source of human society, law and political organization springs from the theatrical concept.

That is, we operate with the concept of "personality", we operate with the concept of "actor."

So what is the significance of the theater, if from the anthropology of the theater, from the idea of what an actor is comes the concept of "personality", "persona" fundamental for human culture and civilization. At this moment, you can shudder, if you follow what I'm talking about, then there should come some surprise like "well, how is that for the theater!".

The theater appears more and more as something really primordial. Firstly, the being is there. Secondly, divine revelation, mysteries are there. But also the simplest, basic, unshakable concepts of law, politics, social disciplines are derived from it. The organization of our entire society is based on the concept of "actor", "personality", that means the carrier of the mask. That's how fundamental the theater is. And this shows how fundamental his main or one of his main elements – the actor.

The actor is the one who is the root cause of personality and the human being is not just portrayed by him, but it is revealed in its essence by the actor. In his game, in his being on the stage, this is where the main vectors, the coordinate system of the human nature as it is distinguished. To the extent that

man is a person. Accordingly, the importance of theater in front of our eyes exceeds all conceivable limits and is growing.

Theory and practice in theater

Here we can say a few more words about the theory and practice of theater. This can be described in detail, but here are the most important things.

First, the theory is not a collection of abstract knowledge about something that needs to be brought to life or verified by life. Not at all like that. Theory is (what we talked about at the beginning) the contemplation of being. This is speculation.

And now, from the point of view of Aristotle, θεωρία is a person's contemplation of his true cause, his natural place, his inner self. Therefore, theory is an immersion in oneself, in our nature, in being. Actually, theory is not necessary a precursor to practice. Theory has a goal in itself.

Therefore, the theater, as the space of theory, doesn't need any practices or methods. It has need, first of all, for itself. The closer the theater is to its essence, the more it will be a theater. But when it moves away from its essence, in spite of any practices and techniques, it cannot be a theater any more. Accordingly, it will be theater to a lesser extent than it could and should be. So, theory is, in fact, the contemplation of being. This is what theory is.

And for practice? This is where a very interesting point arises. Aristotle not only talks about the difference between theory and practice, but also about the difference between practice and technics. And this is the most important thing.

What is "practice", πράξις according to Aristotle? To his mind, if theory is an immersion in oneself, then practice is an appeal of a theorizing person to the outside world. But he emphasizes that practice is only such an action of a person facing the outside world, which is based on an internal solution, on complete freedom. The practice is the property of the man capable to theorize, it is something that belongs

exclusively to theoretician, to the person that is master of contemplations. So practice is in some way continuation of theory but oriented to exteriority and not into interiority.

A man who decides to build a house is performing practice. It is because he conceived this house in his inner vision, he made the existential decision to do that and he thought through all resources he needed to gather and all works he should undertake or order. And a slave, who was given the task of building a house, does not practice. It was not he who made the decision, his actions are not related to his contemplation, because he does not have this right to contemplate. Therefore, a slave, who can also be a skilled craftsman, what he does is not called "practice". Practice, *πρᾶξις* is that in which participates the full-fledged free being of a person contemplating his essence.

So what is practice? Practice is not a separation from theory, but the conversion of theoretical vector to the outside world. Therefore, in fact, practice does not prove anything to theory. Practice simply can correctly, authentically apply this theory, and can run into some internal and external limitations or be distorted. Accordingly, the antithesis of practice is not theory, but technics, *τέχνη* (art). And technics are quite another thing. They can belong both to a freely building homeowner and to a slave.

Technics, *τέχνη* don't describe, don't apply to this essential/existential dimension, with which the theory and its solutions are associated.

From theatrical practices toward theatrical technics

Therefore, theatrical practices and theatrical techniques should be separated. Someone who is an actor, one who belongs to the being of the choir, to the anthropology of the theater, must engage in theatrical practices, because this is precisely the task of a true actor, a person in the theater. He must transmit outside (with reference to the outside world) through theater and theory, without breaking away from this essence, this fundamental impulse of turning to himself. It can be called "an inalienable action". This is what theatrical practice is.

Theatrical technics is something completely different. They don't tell at all about how much the person itself, in its roots, is involved in the process of performing this or that work. Technics are a depersonalized thing. Perhaps, in technics there is an individual, there are certain skills, there is some kind of art, but in technics fundamentally there can be a human or unhuman. It is neutral being separated from theory – and thus from ontology. Technics have something dehumanizing in themselves. They become humanized only when they turn into practice. Otherwise, they lose this dimension.

This is a very important proportion that in the history of theater theatrical practices are gradually being replaced by theatrical techniques. Accordingly, theatrical anthropology is changing.

We are moving from free people who decided sua sponte to associate their fate with the being of the stage (this is practice), toward some guest workers, into some technical elements that have mastered some techniques and wrap their hands in such an implausible way, make noise and are just silly on the stage (that we largely see in more modern theater).

And when the sacred leaves the theater, not only the theoretical, but also the practical part goes away. It is very important. And they are replaced by technics. And technics in general have nothing to do with the theater, because this is alienation from the theory, thus from theater and, accordingly, something different.

Dionysus is a mask

It is very important to note: we talked about the fact that Dionysus was the god of theater, the whole theatrical history and structure goes back to him. It should be said that Dionysus was often portrayed not only by statues, sometimes of a young man, sometimes of an elderly man (Bacchus), but simply as a mask. That is very enlightening. This god of theater is not something that was simply hidden behind a mask, and not the mask of some character that it depicts. Dionysus, in a sense, is a mask. And again we return to the choir. Dionysus is not on either side of this mask. He is not personified by a mask, he is not under a mask, he does not look at a mask. He is a mask.

Dionysus as a mask is a point of contact of the most diversified angles of being reduced to one. And this is a very important point, since the mask is the person, the mask is the face, the guise. Dionysus is the archetype of personality. It is the personality that is the being of the actor, the being of the director that puts on the stage, comes down, because if he incorrectly draws or sculpts this role from the actor, that is, the mask, then his message will not reach others, they will not see anything. And therefore, the being of a mask itself is a unique revelation that only a theater person knows. Why do actors in life tend to be empty? Because they give everything, their being, they give their whole life to be masks. They leave nothing to themselves. But this is their deed; this is their human heroism, because in their fate they give place to something that they, like ordinary people, could not get into.

And this mask has its own being. Mask is more primordial than the one who is hiding under it, or the one who looks at it, or the one whom it portrays.

The mask (when we talk about the mask) - we should not immediately jump: "This is the mask of an elephant / No, this is the mask of god / No, this is the mask of a satyr." The mask as such is more important than "the mask of whom?" The mask answers the question "what?" rather than "whose?". A mask is just a person, that is, it is a person, as such. Not some kind of personality, but a personality just in its roots.

Here we can recall an interesting sarcophagus, with bas-reliefs of the Dionysian procession, where masked satyrs participate in the procession of Dionysus, (masked people and satyrs). And one satyr removes his mask – and... another satyr's face appears from underneath. That is, under the guise of one satyr, there hides another one. He takes off one mask (with horns, with a beard) -- and we see the same satyr again. This is very important because satyr is a mask (in smaller proportions than his master Dionysus).

The man is a mask. Deity is the mask. Anything in the world, by and large, from the point of view of anthropology of theater is a mask. Not a mask of somebody, but just a mask...

Part III. Desacralization and resacralization of theater

Sacred roots of theater

Now, the third part of this course is devoted to the desacralization and resacralization of the theater.

Actually, we talked about the fact that the theater was originally a sacred phenomenon, or some preparation for the mysteries, or part of the mystery, a light version of the mystery. Accordingly, the unique content of the classical sacred theater is a story about gods and heroes, but in fact - about being. And when the theater fulfills this philosophical metaphysical function, then it is a theater. In that function it was conceived, born, manifested and existed not just for a while, but almost always. And that was its goal, its *raison d'être*.

The sense of the theater is to narrate about the sacred. By the way, one can notice such a thing: theater (classical theater) is first of all a play, based on dialogues. But what are Plato's dialogues? They can be considered as plays. These are plays. These are plays where we see heroes, wisemen, politicians, eloquent rhetors, sometimes fools and the characters alike. Sometimes Plato even describes some of the gestures of the participants that remind us of actors. In any case, the ultimate saturation with vivid existential elements (in "Phaedrus", for example but as well in other pieces) with Socrates' huge and unique sense of subtle humor, with an infinite number of existential psychological and rhetorical tricks is very comparable with real drama – and sometimes with satiric piece.

This is the deepest theater. Plato's dialogues are theater. But this is as well a sacred theater. This is a philosophical theater.

In fact, I think that Plato's dialogues are even more theatrical than Sophocles's or Aristophanes' plays, in my opinion. Because here is put the question about being in its purest form, about being, to which we make our way through myth, through archetypes, through the figures of gods, through dialectics – into being itself. So the philosophical theater is the highest form of theater; the sacred dialogues in depth are the most true sources of theater.

Then comes the mythological theater, which is directly connected with the philosophical theater. Philosophical and mythological theaters are not two different versions, they are, in fact, the same theater.

Either you can talk about the structure of being, describing the gods and their relationship with each other, or with men, or with cosmos, or you can talk about being or contemplating ideas. So the theater was always like that when it was true to itself. Namely, a theater and a sacred theater are not just a theater and some version of it. It is the only theater worthy of that name.

Initially, the theater in its origins and the final version of the theater, the theater as such, is a sacred theater. Where there is no philosophical content, where there is no myth, where there is no transcendent norms, where the world is not established, where there is no demiurgic cosmogenesis – there is no theater. Accordingly, all this is the theater itself.

Disappearance of metaphysical dimension: anthropology of spectators

Now, in modernity times, the theater is certainly undergoing desacralization. The theater's philosophical, metaphysical foundations are taken away, it is no longer the place where people come in order to enter in the realm of the sacred.

Now in order to emphasize and to explore in depth the nature of the desacralization I want to say something about the audience as such, about the anthropology of spectators. This will be appropriate here.

When we talk about the anthropology of the theater, we usually talk about the anthropology of the actors (which was discussed). But that is the right moment to ask: what role do the spectators play when they come to the theater? In fact, if we look carefully and extend the metaphor of theater and theory (contemplation), we could imagine a group of people coming to the theater and sitting down on their chairs situated in circles (as in *Inferno*), arriving there to contemplate something important. They have come to see a play. But sitting there they somehow begin to play themselves. What role are they playing? They play the role of the souls. Thus the audience is those people who play the role of (initiated or in process to be initiated) souls watching what is happening in the center of the world.

This, in fact, is a small death – a theater trip. You find yourself deprived of your usual living world, the light is turned off -- it's as if you are put in a coffin. Accordingly, you forget about your usual external, non-theatrical life, you are placed in a new artificial space where you especially do not care about your body and your earthly life. You are all attention, you are all gaze, you are all hearing, you are all contemplation. But such is the existence of the soul in the sacred world. The spectators form the chorus, the sacred ring. They are stars observing the cosmic drama.

Therefore, theatrical spectators are those souls who sit in the temple or, perhaps, in the posthumous hierarchy of orders and levels, and observe the most important that happens in the world. Accordingly, this is the deepest practice, the spiritual practice of the theater. You must deserve to be a spectator. You must be competent enough to be one.

We all probably know some of the most annoying, unpleasant people who blow their nose, turn on smartphones in the theater – we see them often, but I'm not really talking about that. They are not real spectators, they are simulacra of true viewers. In order to be a full-fledged spectator, you must truly

follow the rules of the theater. And to sit at your chair as quiet as dead. You should cede your body, your flesh along with your coat to cloakroom attendants, you should allow this blackout (placing in the coffin) and surrender to what is happening on the stage, correctly interpreting the sacred message that you receive from these unusual living creatures, which we call “actors”, but who are masks, living signs of the real metaphysical multi-layer world. And we do not need to recognize someone under mask: “Oh, I know him, this is one or another star”. No, there is something other. When we begin to recognize actors under masks or beneath the roles and characters – the theater ends. It is necessary that in the actor we see the one he portrays, with the help of the mask or not. We do not need to know anything actors personal fate and personal life. The actor must disappear, and this is his transformation, this is the moment of his self-overcoming. And he does this to reveal the truth to souls. But in order to receive the message transmitted in that way we need as well to forget ourselves. We need to let the other inside to enter in us – the other from within. This other is eternal soul, stellar spark, our innermost Self.

Imagine what a fundamental mission the sacred theater had.

Humanism and realism as degeneration

When the theater becomes humanistic – it all ends there.

Henceforth realistic theater affirms: “Now we will speak not of gods (there are no gods), not of souls (there is no soul either, there is only the body and the nervous system), we will not talk about ideas that exist eternally, because ideas are our thoughts, and we will not make and create life, explaining its essence, but will simply reflect what is outside the walls of this theater.”

From all that living world of daytime, of routine, of banality original theater wanted to escape, to isolate, to hide, entering into the night, going down to the crypt, turning off the lights, putting us in a coffin. All this the sacred theater wanted to overcome. It wanted to make the events in theatrical production exceptional, exclusive. Well, in the realistic theater, in humanistic theater, it all ends.

Now we are told quit the opposite: “You came here to see how everything around you, what people live around you, uncle Vanya[12], a doctor who always groans, forgotten servant Firs[13]”- well, in these are ordinary stories, you always forget someone somewhere[14]. Yes, this, of course, is very cute, but it is not theater at all, or it is a theater with some other meaning.

We don't see archetypes any more, we see only human living their everyday lives. Yes, of course, these humans can be also typologically important, they can be sometimes unusual people. Let us agree that in this humanistic theater we are often shown unusual, some bright, amazing people, or vice versa - too small people, such an image of a small person for whom we feel pity to make one cry. In other words, they can be however exceptional, but still exclusively humans. Always. In their misery, in their exceptional insignificance. But these are humans, they are no longer neither gods nor angels nor demons. They are no longer heroes overcoming the limits of human nature. They are locked inside the boundaries of the earthly life. They are deprived of transcendence.

This, of course, is another theater. This is a theater where the concept of dissembler, hypocrite, hiding one under the mask of another mask takes on a different nature. Baudrillard called it the "first order of simulacra", like an Italian waistcoat, which was men's clothing for those who did not have enough good expensive fabric for the back. Therefore, the front part is made of expensive material, and the rear part – of something worse. And this is called, according to Baudrillard, "the first order of simulacra." Such is the humanist theater – waistcoat.

From heroic humanism to mechanical humanism

In fact, modern theater is starting from the era of the Modernity and at this transitional moment, appears Shakespeare, which is already half sacred, half humanistic, modernist. Renaissance - at this very moment the theater is being desacralized. But somehow the reappearance of the theater after the pause of the Middle Ages was more complicated phenomenon. Certainly the Renaissance was humanism but that was very special magical humanism, the heroic humanism dealing with divine humanity – with homo maximus.

From Renaissance on this desacralization moved further and further, reaching its last boundaries.

In the late Soviet theater there were such plays (few people remember, you are young) which should be consider as a punishment to watch. They were dull and essentially materialistic (and sometimes incredibly stupid). I remember being forced to watch (when we were small, in the 70-ies) plays of Arbuzov[15]. This was a real hell. There were two TV programs I was made to look for my presumably bad behavior: these are plays by Arbuzov and the "Lenin University of Millions"[16]. Both sights made me monstrously depressed and sad. Can you imagine the play about some Soviet ordinary engineer

working at factory who was a bit too rude to a woman worker. So offended she went away - I wanted to say and she hadn't return, but not. If she hadn't returned, it could have been a little reminiscent of Lynch at least. Something like Inland Empire... But that was not the case. She went out and soon returned, and brought a suitcase full of goods from the city. At the end of the play she pardoned the engineer and started to work as usually performing her duty at factory. Nothing happened. Just Soviet living world going round and round as in never ending sleep... And all this is endless.

So humanism has lost its epic content, turned in something so mechanical, that one couldn't remember anything. Such a gloomy thing as the late Soviet culture as a whole, in my opinion, that it's just such an endless fundamental boredom. And the theater was its vanguard, the zone of decay and devastating slightly embellished by theater foyer. But still it was humanism. Plays by Arbuzov or something like that were about humans.

Nihilistic theater of Post-Modernity

But the process of desacralizing the theater and losing its meaning could not be stopped on humanism, because man is a too complex creature, too metaphysical, not technical enough.

And that is why the nihilistic theater of postmodernism came, which actually began to decompose not only the archetypes of gods and heroes, but the man as such. Its characters are not any more humans, albeit ordinary, small, big, not heroes, but some scattered hallucinations, objects (as in the object-oriented ontology), rhizomatic objects, half-human, half-inhuman.

Thus from humanism we are moving to the realm of pure nihilism. A postmodern theater, contemporary theater - is a theater where the technology totally prevails over practice. In principle, that means the theater loses completely and absolutely its meaning, its metaphysics, its content, and in fact we come to some kind of matrix theater. It is pure technic where machines, screens and androids are replacing step by step the rest of humanity. In contemporary theatrical productions of avant-garde (namely postmodernist) teapots sing their symphony, gurneys take out corpses to expose commenting the histories of deceased or bones powder dances the strange ballet.

This combination – a chaotic theater, a theater of such a disembodied irrational whirls -- emphasizes a certain mechanistic structure of our life. In fact, this is not just mechanical theater (and we should remember, the theater could never completely broke the connection with being), so this theater shows us what being is around us, and not only shows, but creates it. The postmodernist theater replace organic being with mechanical technical simulacrum of being, existing as great machine of production of signs totally devoided of meanings (semiurgy in Baudrillard's terminology).

Theater: most powerful thing

The theater has never lost its power completely, that's important.

Initially, it was a holy, sacred power.

Then it was humanistic power (remember the bright humanistic actors who really created the images of Shakespeare, for example, extraordinary, but human dramas and passions, intense, saturated, tearing everything apart). Thus, initially humanism not only reflected, but created the realities and ontologies that it depicted. This theater (and even in the Renaissance and Modernity), although it was a simulation of the sacred, still retained its original power. And it created humanistic world.

The realists in theater used to announce "the theater just reflects the life as it is", but in fact it was not so. The realism created this humanistic realistic world, supported it, inserted a program of humanism in the viewers, in the souls of audience and transformed them in accordance with new modernist philosophical models, installing new Cartesian dualist paradigms, bourgeois standards and democratic ideals. Still in the Modernity the theater had a major influence on culture, history, even politics. Theater under excuse of faithful description in fact created the totally new reality.

Theater was and still is a very powerful thing. Moreover, the theater is the most powerful thing. And when we move into the postmodern paradigm, we see that here also the theater not only reflects the mechanism of modern culture, the decomposition of large narratives, the denudation of mechanical behavioristic (psychoanalytic) schemes, the exposition of the virtualization of everyday life – not just uses these multimedia tools to blur the line between the theater and the screen, between the theater

and virtual reality, social network. It makes the reality of the life to be exactly like this. It imposes its codes and rules, enforces them, obliges them to be accepted – consciously and unconsciously.

Today's theater is theater in which different heterogeneous aspects of virtual postmodern paradigm and (post)existence merge in something new and indiscernibly mixed.

In the end, post-modern theater occasionally does not require neither an auditorium nor a stage. It can directly play in our minds. In some modern plays virtual objects act and screens and planes displace each other ...

New Beginning of the theater?

This theater-matrix encodes our society. The theater retains its power even in Post-Modernity, despite the fact the postmodern theater largely delegated these functions to the cinema, which performs this encoding more effectively. But still it survived as the main laboratory for the production of this fundamental potency.

And the last question that we will not certainly answer during this introductory lecture (in this lecture we already have no time for that, and I doubt honestly as for the whole course) is whether a New Beginning of the theater is possible, is the Conservative Revolution possible in the theater, is it possible to resacralize the theater, and return to its roots, is it possible to put this inappropriate actor back in the choir and return to the theater his fundamental ontology and anthropology that we have lost?

Political Platonism

<https://www.gornahoor.net/?p=11340>

Posted on 2019-11-05 by Cologero

The philosophical background of Guenon and his followers' traditionalism is extremely close to the Platonic tradition ... In other words, traditionalism can be taken as radical Platonism. ~ Alexander Dugin, Political Platonism.

Dugin's purpose seems to be to make Tradition academically palatable, by couching it in Platonic language. Obviously, as we shall demonstrate, unlike Dugin, there are certainly correspondences with Plato. However, Guenon probably refers to Aristotle and the Scholastics more than to Plato, so we shall also rely on them in developing a "Platonic" political system. Unfortunately, Dugin makes this rather strange assertion:

Traditionalism offers the entire necessary philosophical, ideational, conceptual, and sociological apparatus [to oppose globalization].

Au contraire, Guenon rejected philosophy as now understood; a fortiori, he had no intention of creating any such apparatus, since it would be a symptom of modernity, not its cure. That is because Dugin presumes that Guenon created a "school" called "Traditionalism". That would make his project just one opinion among many. Now Guenon anticipated that; this is what he wrote about "Traditionalism":

["traditionalists" refer] to people who only have a sort of tendency or aspiration towards tradition without really knowing anything at all about it; this is the measure of the distance dividing the "traditionalist" spirit from the truly traditional spirit, for the latter implies a real knowledge ... ~ See The Absurdity of Traditionalism

I hate to sound harsh, but those are Guenon's words. Dugin is not alone; even Charles Upton refers to a "School of Traditionalism". And they are hardly alone in promoting that misunderstanding. Reputations are built on the ignorance of readers.

Since we are on the topic of Platonism, we must understand the distinction he made between opinion and real knowledge. Guenon is not interested in opinion, since opinions can be mistaken. Most thinkers

are, since it is more fun to debate. On the other hand, knowledge is of Being or Reality and cannot be mistaken. Guenon calls the transition from opinion to knowledge as an “intellectual conversion” or “metaphysical realization”. For the soi disant Traditionalists, such knowledge is simply invisible to them, beyond their intellectual horizon, so they fail to understand it, and, worse, don’t even seek it.

Structure of Man and Society

We begin a Platonic political system with an understanding of the Being of man, who is constituted by the three soul forces, and united by a Self:

Concupiscence (eros)

Irascibility (thumos)

Intellect (nous)

The I

This is not a matter of opinion, but rather true knowledge of man’s Being. When this is applied to political life, we get the idea of castes:

Workers and producers

Those holding political power

Those wielding spiritual authority

The (one) leader, chief, king, emperor, etc.

Georges Dumézil documented the same socio-political structures in Traditional societies. Hence, those structures are not at all arbitrary, but follow from the Real structure of man and society. Alternative political systems are simply deformations of this. Usually, the political powers and spiritual authorities are not explicitly acknowledged but are illicitly smuggled in.

Being and Thought

As Thomas Aquinas points out in *De Principiis Naturae*, generation, or Being, requires three principles:

being in potency which is matter (Prime Matter, or what Dugin calls Chaos)

non-existence in act which is privation

that through which something comes to be in act which is form (or essences)

That is, Existence is generated by essences imposing themselves on prime matter. We experience existence, but know essences. Modern dualistic philosophies separate existence and essence. However, there is no duality, even though the modern mind has trouble discerning essences. Spiritual vision must be developed in order to intuit the essences that generate phenomena.

Privation, which is the negation of form, adds a level of difficulty. Privation is known in Thought, but confused in Being. Therefore, care must be taken to distinguish the part of a being that is the manifestation of the form from privation which is the inability of the form to completely manifest itself. Only in God is there no privation, since His existence and essence are identical.

Struggle for Existence

Although some still hope for some Utopian time of peace, the struggle for Existence is part of the fabric of nature. Even in Eden, Adam was expected to work. That means he was incomplete, subject to privation, and still needed to manifest all his possibilities.

Moreover, there was temptation in the Garden in the form of the forbidden fruit and the serpent. Therefore, Adam still had to face the Greater Battle against his lower nature.

There is a persistent idea that the animals had a different nature from what we see now. However, the naming of the animals means that Adam understood their true nature. The beasts are wholly natural beings, with no supernatural graces, so the lions were certainly not dining on Impossible Burgers. Thomas Aquinas offers this rationale:

In the opinion of some, those animals which now are fierce and kill others, would, in that state, have been tame, not only in regard to man, but also in regard to other animals. But this is quite unreasonable. For the nature of animals was not changed by man's sin, as if those whose nature now it is to devour the flesh of others, would then have lived on herbs, as the lion and falcon. ~ Summa Theologica, 1 Q 96

Inasmuch as Man shares in the nature of animals, Man is involved in the Lesser Struggle against material forces and enemies. Work, temptation, and struggle are permanent aspects of life.

Since Traditional political arrangements deal with reality, not speculative thought, the horizontal struggle involves the battle to protect and defend man's natural life. This includes the family, clan, tribe, and, of course, the City.

POPULISM: THE RULE OF THE PEOPLE AND THE NEW GLOBAL IDEOLOGY

Primary tabs

[View](#)(active tab) [What links here](#)

Alexander Dugin

Many people think that “populism” is just a pejorative designation of spontaneous anti-elite performances in Europe and other countries that affect the landscape of modern politics. “Populism” is most often understood as the absence of a consistent political ideology — such as social democracy, liberal democracy, socialism, nationalism, or clearly formulated republican ideas. Moreover, “populism” is considered to be all that falls outside the bounds of the ideology that modern global elites adhere to.

Today, the elites profess liberalism almost everywhere. The debate is only about what should be more in liberalism - the right part (emphasis on the economy, freedom of enterprise, large markets, monopolies, tax cuts, etc.) or the left (gender policy, migrants, human rights, etc.) But both there and there we are talking about liberalism (economic, political or generalized, integral). Everything that goes beyond the limits of this widely understood (right-left) liberalism is usually called "populism."

The end of history and the triumph of liberalism

Political science, in addition to liberalism, distinguishes non-liberal, illiberal or even anti-liberal ideologies - nationalism (anti-liberalism on the right) and communism, socialism, social democracy (anti-liberalism on the left). But they are not populist, because we are talking about full-fledged worldviews (fascist, national socialist or communist), which are ideologically and historically defeated by liberalism. In the course of the twentieth century, liberalism first defeated fascism (together with communism), and then communism (in the Cold War). This was the political and ideological content of this century. From now on, the dominant (politically correct) ideology remained exclusively liberal.

Fukuyama's thesis about the “end of history” is based on the fact that liberalism has historically triumphed, since there are no more fascists or communists. More precisely, neither the Nazis nor the Communists pose a serious and thorough - symmetrical - threat or alternative to liberalism. But since only liberals remained on a planetary scale, they have no one to argue with, no one to wage an ideological struggle - all the elites of all countries are liberal, the alternatives are exhausted and defeated, they are over, there are no more grounds for ideological conflicts. Now, Fukuyama reasoned,

the world will become a global united liberal humanity under the leadership of global liberal elites and the World Government. The policy will be replaced by the economy. There will be a single World State - a global civil society, "open society."

The basis for the "end of history", according to Fukuyama, are two fundamental facts: the end of communism in 1991 and the earlier end of fascism (in 1943) and national socialism (in 1945). Later, milder forms of nationalism were finally dismantled - Peronism in Argentina, Franco regimes in Spain and Salazar in Portugal. The latest ideologies of the "Third Way" in the Third World (in the spirit of Arab Ba'athism) fell not long ago. All illiberal ideologies today are destroyed along with their carriers - countries, regimes, political systems, economic models. There was only liberalism, with its practices, values.

Populism: liberals fall prey to "conspiracy theory"

In the 2000s and especially in the last decade - since 2010 - a completely new phenomenon appears in politics that challenges liberalism. It arises primarily in the West, but it is constantly and fairly rapidly growing and expanding throughout the world more and more, all over the world. This began to be called "populism": mass protests against the policies of global liberal elites, the nomination of new leaders to defend such an orientation, and the growing influence of populist parties and movements. Moreover, this populist challenge, being oriented strictly against liberalism, does not come from the Communists (they are no longer global power) and not from the Nazis (especially since they are not there, the fascist regimes were defeated more than half a century ago). There is neither Nazi Germany, nor fascist Italy, nor the USSR. There are no more illiberal regimes, and the ideologies and political systems corresponding to them have disintegrated, scattered, and become a thing of the past.

The communist regime in China cannot be considered in the full sense of the word neither "communist", nor even "left". In economics, it is based on liberalism, and politics relies on accented nationalism and realism. In the ideology itself, Confucian motives are increasingly growing, significantly changing the very content of Chinese society. With all the successes of China, this syncretic and ever-changing set of ideas with the predominance of pragmatism can hardly be considered a serious ideological alternative for liberals. Moreover, earlier, especially in the 1980s and even in the 1990s, most analysts believed that the liberal reforms of the Chinese economy would naturally lead to the weakening of the power of the Communist Party and ultimately abolished, and China to follow the post-Soviet path. This did not happen, but still China is still not seen as a serious ideological alternative to liberalism.

Nevertheless, liberalism has an enemy - it is populism. In fact, this is an illiberal policy, which is not nationalistic (fascist), nor socialist or communist. This new phenomenon in politics has become an almost abusive concept. Liberals cannot recognize the existence of any kind of anti-liberal ideology beyond fascism and communism and are trying to impose such an interpretation of "populism" that would refer this phenomenon to a new form of fascism or left anarchism. Liberal elites are trying to explain populism with the help of old ideological clichés (such as veiled fascism, cryptofascism or veiled communism, cryptocommunism). Thus, a new type of "conspiracy theory" arises, which liberals now believe in (whereas earlier it was the property of marginal - often extremist social groups)

Italy's yellow-green government and yellow vests: against the liberal Center

In fact, we see totally different thing in populist movements. Populism is the rejection of liberalism - yes. This rebellion against global liberal elites - yes, exactly. This is a sharp and thorough - conscious - disagreement with everything that liberal globalist elites say and do. The populists clearly and clearly realize that neither liberal theories nor the ensuing bottom-up practices are acceptable to them, but the results of putting these practices into practice. Since the growth of migration, multiculturalism, gender policy, posthumanism (and transhumanism), the breakdown of traditional families and the promotion of new technologies (virtualization, Artificial Intelligence, etc.) are an integral part of liberal ideology, the costs of introducing this into society are dissatisfied - it's completely logical - attributed to the liberals. So the populist protest is directed against the specific actions of the liberal elites, and, most importantly, against their worldview.

The rebellion of populists in Italy led to the creation of the yellow-green government of Di Maio-Salvini (left populists Di Maio from "Five Stars" and right populists of Salvini from the "League"). Despite the dissimilarity of the theses of the "Five Stars" and the "League", the object of their common hatred and total rejection is the liberal Renzi, a prominent representative of the globalist Center, liberal democracy. Similarly, in France, the Yellow Vests - neither right nor left - are rebelling endlessly against Macron, who is the embodiment of liberalism. Who is Macron? This is a mechanical module that does not have its own position and embodies the general strategy of global elites. At the head of France today stands the faceless and narcissistic ordinary Rothschild functionary. The French reject him both because of the inefficiency of his policy, and because of his arrogance, and because of the slurredness of his discourse. But most importantly, he is rejected because of his liberalism. Macron is not even a liberal, but liberalism itself. It is so "no one" (as a politician, as a person) that liberalism passes through it unhindered, almost like Artificial Intelligence.

Populism wants to be neither left nor right

So what is populism? What is this phenomenon that opposes liberalism and yet is neither communism nor fascism? This is the most interesting. Those who carefully and thoughtfully follow this process in the West recognize that this is a new phenomenon. They agree that it is indeed wrong, too simplistic, and incorrect to describe populism as cryptofascism, cryptocommunism, or even their combination. Conspiracy theories and old clichés applied to new phenomena only distort the picture, confuse it, and do not allow one to understand the essence. No, this is completely different, because it is a phenomenon that categorically and quite consciously refuses to explain itself in ideological terms, which dictates the politics of Modern.

Populism does not want to be left, does not want to be Marxism, does not want to be social democracy - and this is very important. The populists reject this - they do not see themselves as bearers of the conventional political ideology of the left in the West. And this is characteristic of all left-wing populists - from The Five Stars (Italy), the Melanshon movement (France), movement of Sahra Wagenknecht (Germany), Podemos (Spain), or supporters of Tulsi Gabbard or Bernie Sanders (USA).

But in the same way, most populists do not see their place in the classical right, nationalist ideology. The populists do not want to be right, they do not want to be nationalists, much less fascists. Among them there is a persistent rejection of migration, there are certain elements of nationalism, but they do not dominate, are not dominant and are characteristic of many European workers who reject migrants not for cultural and ethnic reasons, but for economic reasons. Some of the populists reject the same unlimited migration for cultural reasons, but without any connection with nationalism, and even more so with racism or xenophobia.

The claim to liberalism is not only migrants. This is an ineffective policy, and a middle-class crisis that is not growing, but shrinking, and the lack of worldviews, and the suffocating domination of large monopolies over the real economy, and gender policy that equates perversions with the norm. For example, in France, opponents of the legalization of same-sex marriages have gathered multimillion-dollar demonstrations as part of the "Manif pour tous". This is overwhelmingly the most common middle French. At such rallies and processions there is no ideology at all - the legalization of same-sex marriage provokes the political indignation of ordinary French people (not communists and non-fascists, just French). Of course, they are trying to write them down as "fascists," because the family is considered a conservative institution, but this is absolutely not so. Manif pour tous does not contain anything "conservative". It's just that people don't agree not with the very presence of homosexuals, but with giving them a normative status and with the adoption of adopted children by such pairs. All of France categorically rejects this, and political elites say - "we wanted to spit on millions of demonstrations, you are nobody, we pass the law on homosexual marriages, and you pigs, keep quiet."

Democracy as a minority power

Thus, liberal elites are becoming more and more arrogant and less and less democratic.

Today, liberalism is at odds with democracy. I had a conversation on Canadian television with Fukuyama, during which I asked him: what is democracy for modern liberals? Is it the power of the majority? He replied that no - this is the power of minorities against the majority.

This is what liberal democracy is today. Liberalism is becoming more and more totalitarian; it no longer admits any democracy (in the usual sense). Liberal elites usurp power, and are called "populists" by all those who question this usurpation. In a sense, populists are closer to democrats (as they were understood before). Populists are a democratic majority movement. Populists are those who view democracy in the old way (democracy is the rule of the majority). And liberal elites see democracy in a new way - as the power of these liberal elites themselves, representing minorities and minorities. That is, in the view of modern liberals, democracy is the power of minorities. Liberals guard minorities against the majority, precisely because the majority is a potential carrier of populism. And further, according to the logic of liberals, the majority can choose someone "wrong one" - for example, not Macron, but Marine Le Pen, not Renzi, but Salvini, not the European Union, but Brexit, not Hilary, but Trump. And this is a disaster for the liberal elites. People can choose the "wrong one".

And what does "right one" mean? From the point of view of classical democracy, "right one" is the one whom the people have chosen. From the point of view of liberals - no, "right one" should be a liberal from the globalist elite, only he is legitimate in their eyes. Therefore, the people have the honorable function to choose the one whom they are told to choose the liberals. And if a people does not want to vote and recognize their legitimacy, then it becomes a "populist," and populism turns out to be a derogatory term that applies to politically incorrect elements of society. The circle closes. In fact, we are dealing with the liquidation of democracy, with its dismantling. All the signs of an ideological dictatorship are evident - the third totalitarianism (if we consider the first totalitarianism to be Soviet and the second to fascist).

People as a Concept: Renaissance and Ancient Origins

Here I wanted to draw attention to the very concept of "people." It has an interesting fate. On the one hand, the people are the basis of all modern democratic constitutions, which states that the people are the legitimate source of power. It would seem how in such a situation it is possible to insult a people with a derogatory term? If a people is a source of power, how can the term "populism" be used to demonize and discredit the most important holder of power? After all, "populism" is the same as "nationality," the word itself is formed from lat. *populus*, fr. *le peuple*, ital. *il popolo* etc. But the people, according to the Constitution, are the main legitimate holder of power. How can one blame the main legitimate bearer of power for being himself ?!

An important consideration arises here, which is of great importance in all senses - including possibly, first of all, in the context of constitutional law: how is the concept of people interpreted with its severity? To understand this, you need to make a brief digression into political history.

Initially, the concept of "people" fell into the constitution of the New Age before the Enlightenment, and since then it has been invariably and firmly there. "People" is a concept of the Renaissance. In the Renaissance, the concept of the people was returned from the cultural circle in which it was known in Antiquity - in classical Greece and in Rome. This term in Greece and Rome was understood as a certain organic community of carriers of a single tradition. The concept of a people has never been quantitative; it has been qualitative. The people consisted of citizens - people of a common origin, ancestors, culture, tradition. The people was a concept that included a strictly defined identity - roots, cults, history, connection with the earth and the gods. The totality of all in a row has never been considered a "people." The people were thought of as a qualitative unity, as carriers of a single culture, a single tradition, a single language, having a common origin, remembering their ancestors. The people included residents of a particular city (*polis*), region, village, locality.

The famous formula is the definition of the "Roman people" - *Populus Quirites Romanus*, which belonged to the "citizens" ("*Quirites*") along with the highest aristocracy of patricians who made up the Senate, which gave the legal formula - S.P.Q.R. (*Senatus Populusque Quirites Romanus*). Not only patricians, but also the Roman people acted as the bearer of power and legitimacy in the system of Roman politics.

The people were the most important category of Antiquity, transferred to the Renaissance, which was characterized by just a new rise in interest in Antiquity. In this context, she entered into legal documents. A people is a very ancient and fundamental concept, high-quality, spiritual, sacred. To be part of the people, to belong to the people is the same as to belong to a living being, closely connected with the divine, with history, with Providence. A people is a providence concept. The idea of God is

embodied among the people, as Herder later defined it in romanticism. The sacred concept of the people fell into the Constitution of the New Time from the Renaissance.

The ideological usurpation of the concept of people

But gradually, already in modern times, this concept began to be interpreted differently. In the texts of the Constitutions themselves it was preserved. This is a tribute to the Renaissance, and therefore, Antiquity. It is this ancient and sacred meaning that is primary even today - in our constitutions, including the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Under the people, which is the highest carrier of power and sovereignty, the ancient meaning is meant.

But gradually, different political ideologies that prevailed in various periods and regimes began to interpret the people in their own way. And here there was a usurpation of this concept: the liberals began to interpret the people as a "set of individuals." The fact is that the ideology of liberalism considers a person to be an individual. And when liberals are confronted with any social phenomenon, they descend it to an atomic individuality. This is precisely the main content of the theory of human rights - this theory completely follows from liberal ideology and, in another context, either radically changes its meaning or completely loses it. But such an interpretation of the people as a set of individual personalities is completely contrary to the Renaissance or ancient concept. This is a modern liberal interpretation. In the limit, we can say that there are no liberals of the people, there are individuals.

Socialist regimes interpreted the people as a class, an even more extravagant interpretation. In part, left-wing ideologies accept the liberal concept of individuals, but reduce all types of people to two classes — the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, which have a different type of consciousness. Therefore, for the ideologists of Marxism or socialism, the people are a heterogeneous mass, which should be divided according to class and whose unity is fictitious. Thus, the class interpretation precedes the very idea of a people, making it conditional, not fundamental, and even deceiving. There are also no people here, there are classes.

The nationalist interpretation is also artificially and ideologically colored. For a nationalist, people are people who have the citizenship of a country. A nation is a political concept. It is an artificial construction based on individual identity. For nationalists and fascists, people are inextricably linked with the state. Racists interpret it through the race, which is also an artificial construct. Thus, for nationalists there is no people, there is a nation (or race).

Thus, in none of the political ideologies (neither in liberalism, nor in socialism, nor in nationalism) does the concept of “people” exist. Moreover, the people cannot be decisive for them, since each ideology interprets it in its own way.

We are forced to state that in modern times there was a fundamental substitution of a fundamental legal concept. The usurpation of the right to interpret that instance, which should be the primary source of any interpretation, has occurred, since interpretation in some sense is power. In fact, by providing an opportunity for the bearers of the main political ideologies of Modernity to interpret the concept of people, we commit a crime against the constitutional system and its foundations.

When some ideological group in society usurps the right to interpret the basic and central legal concept - “people”, acting as the highest source of power, and therefore both legality and legitimacy, we are talking about the fact of an unauthorized seizure of power, about usurpation.

The populist uprising today is the return of the people to their legal, constitutional rights. In any modern ideology (liberal, nationalist, socialist) people, in fact, do not exist. Instead of the people there is its interpretation based on one or another ideology. But in this way the usurpation of the constitutional rights of the people occurs. The people themselves are deprived of their being, deprived of content.

Populism brings us back to this theft, to this constitutional crime. Strictly speaking, liberalism, communism and fascism should be legally prohibited. Therefore, the power of liberal elites, based on ideology (individualistic interpretation of the concept of people), is not only not legitimate, but criminal at the root. This is a legal state crime.

Constitutional Prohibition of Ideology

It is very interesting that in the Constitution of the Russian Federation there is a ban on ideology. If we take a closer look, this ban on ideology can have a very deep meaning. Of course, this point was introduced in the 90s by liberals who sought to get rid of Soviet ideology and put the maximum number of barriers to its revival. The liberals who were in power in Russia in the 90s, thereby wanted to ban all ideologies other than their own - that is, from liberalism. But the constitutional provision itself, albeit adopted situationally, remains as it is. In Russia, any ideology is banned as a state. Including - and above

all - liberal. The liberal cannot speak on behalf of the state, give liberal ideas, definitions and philosophical theses the status of an official position. This also applies to other ideologies. But this is true, first of all, with respect to liberals who clearly abuse power - primarily in such areas as economics, education, and culture, and do it on behalf of the government, state, and government.

Therefore, the constitutional rule on the prohibition of ideology should be interpreted as a prohibition on usurping the rights of the people to have the fullness of their own sovereignty.

No ideology can tell us what a people is. Only the peoples know who they are; only the people need to be asked about this, and only the people are the subject of history and the main carrier of sovereignty and law.

Populism as a return of people to politics

Populism is this return of the people to politics. But when the people try to say that they do not like the ideology of the ruling elites, the elites begin to struggle with the people.

What political moment do we live in today? Today, the struggle of the usurpers of the rights of the people against the people itself is unfolding. And this problem is not limited to Western countries. Almost the same thing happens in other areas of the world. Including in Russia. Liberal elites are global. Segments of this globalist network as the fifth and sixth columns are in almost all states. And almost everywhere they occupy a leading position in the relevant political systems. There is solidarity between these elites: everyone has a common enemy, a people (regardless of what kind of people they are talking about), who are challenging them today, gradually discovering the fact of usurpation of power, the illegitimacy of the very phenomenon of liberal dictatorship, which today has an almost planetary scale. The "End of History" in the 90s, proclaimed by Fukuyama, was an appeal to liberal global elites to unite in a World Government. But this was not destined to take place: liberal plans came up against the resistance of the peoples. Moreover, it did not come from classical ideological opponents (nationalism and communism), but from a lively and straightforward majority of the people. From democracy itself.

Imperative of solidarity of peoples in the fight against the globalist elite

Liberalism is an unconstitutional ideology, and the other ideologies of communism or fascism are exactly the same. All three forms of interpretation of the people (through liberalism, socialism or nationalism) are unconstitutional because they claim to interpret the basic concept of the Constitution. They are possible only in the second stage. The people demand: first recognize me as the main sovereign, and only then - subject to the recognition of my integrity, integrity, superiority and sovereignty - offer your interpretations, but not vice versa. You (liberals, communists or fascists) have no right to impose anything on the people, based on the interpretation of yourself in accordance with your biased and subjective political teachings.

That are the reasons of the rise of populism. This is the deepest ideological, constitutional, legal process that can end either with the abolition of the people from the Constitution (and thus the end of democracy in general), or with the revolution of the people - when the global liberal elites are simply destroyed, swept away and, ultimately, set outlaw. Because their global power is illegal. To be a liberal today, a member of the liberal elite means to be a criminal, a usurper. This is an unconstitutional act. Liberalism is unconstitutional and should be recognized as such. We have no hesitation when we declare an ideology calling for terror and violence prohibited. Liberalism carries out semantic terror, ideological violence. This is a totalitarian sect today, taking advantage of the historical moment in order to gain unlimited power on a global scale. Today this sect feels that a wave of popular anger is rising against it. And she counterattacks, trying to push the sprouts of populism in the bud.

This is the new ideological and political map: liberals (right and left) against populists ("right" and "left", but in fact, neither right, nor left) or, what is the same, elites against peoples. Globalist elites are international, they clearly recognize their planetary solidarity, common interests and the need to support each other in the struggle against peoples. The peoples are fragmented. Therefore, in the uprising of populism, that is, peoples, any signs of nationalism (the third political theory) can be extremely dangerous. Liberals will not fail to take advantage of conflicts between peoples to continue to hold them under their own power. This implies the imperative: populists should be no less united in their struggle than their opponents globalists.

Ban on three ideologies

Why are we talking more about liberalism? Because, unlike the ideological conditions of the twentieth century, today socialism is not particularly influential and, moreover, does not have the ability to totalitarianly dictate its ideological principles. Also, socialists today have almost no influence on the definition of basic legal categories. And if they do, then in the case of China or North Korea, then only on a regional scale and moreover, an adequate assessment of this influence requires a thorough analysis of

such legal systems as Chinese or North Korean. And there everything is far from what it seems to an outside observer. But it goes without saying that the ban on ideology should concern not only liberals, but also leftists.

Accordingly, nationalists should be legally banned, because they replace the people with their concepts (etatist, nationalist, racist or xenophobic, but in any case artificial). The danger of nationalism lies precisely in the fact that it can easily transfer the righteous anger of peoples directed against the ruling elites to other peoples, minorities or representatives of other cultures and faiths. Globalists will not fail to take advantage of this.

The people and their Word

The people must go forward. That he should be the main carrier of sovereignty. In almost all modern societies, this is not so. And it should be so. Therefore, most modern societies are illegal, unconstitutional. The power structure in these modern - most often liberal - societies is in direct conflict with basic constitutional rights.

Populism should not be perceived simply as a spontaneous reaction of the population to the illegitimacy of globalist elites. This should become a new ideology that puts people at the forefront. This must be a democratic movement. This should be a constitutional process of the struggle of the people for their sovereignty.

The people should not humiliate themselves, ask, or even demand from the elites "give us rights, provide us with a better life." Modern elites are illegitimate. We must not turn to them, we must free ourselves from them, displace them, and abolish them. They simply should not be. Liberal elites are usurpers of power, they are unconstitutional. And the place of people who committed the coup d'etat, at least, in places not so distant (if not worse).

Those people who are now declaring war on the people and using the concept of "populism" in a derogatory manner are the enemies of our peoples. These are anti-constitutional elements that have usurped the right to speak on behalf of society, on our behalf, on behalf of the people.

No one except the people can speak on his behalf. Therefore, the struggle of peoples for their voice, for their power and for their supremacy is a historical battle for the word - for the Word.

4pt

POST-ANTHROPOLOGY

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Human Society after the Crisis: Hell on Earth Through the Lens of Deep Sociology

Sociology of the depths

A concrete (phenomenal) society always consists of two parts - the aboveground and underground. The aboveground part is what we normally term "society", meaning a sphere of rational activity where logos (λόγος) prevails. This is the domain of the "diurnal". The underground part is the dark, underwater island of the collective unconscious, the region of the social night (the "nocturne"), where myth (μῦθος) rules.

For some time, progressivist science believed that these two parts were situated in diachronic order. In ancient times (and among "primitive" peoples, the unfortunate "residue" of ancient times), myth was predominant. But the progress of civilization gradually supplanted the mythological order and replaced it with an order based on logos. The community, or Gemeinschaft, is superseded by society, or Gesellschaft (F. Tönnies). But this optimistic exaltation did not last long. Whereas blind faith in purported progress reigned almost unquestionably in 18th-19th century Western Europe, the subconscious, where the eternal and unchanging laws of myth predominate, was discovered by the beginning of the 20th century.

Jung's works developed Freud's theory and established a new topology of human psychology. Freud had already shown that in addition to the "I" (the "ego"), an invisible and repressed "It" (German "es", Latin "id") actively operates within man. Jung demonstrated that the foundation of this "It" is rooted in a special reality common to all people. The collective unconscious is one for all.

Jung's follower, the French sociologist G. Durand, relying on the Jungian theory of the collective unconscious and its archetypes, complemented the psychoanalytic topology with a sociological one, thus laying the foundations for a "sociology of depths", "deep sociology", or "sociology of imagination." Thus, the second, underground part of society, at the heart of which lies myth, was discovered, studied, and imparted with description.

Ordinary sociologists such as Weber, Sombart, Durkheim, Moss, Sorokin and so on, more often described aboveground, diurnal society and its properties, i.e., the social logos. Sociologists of the depths, on the other hand, such as G. Durand or M. Maffessoli, engaged in the exploration of social myths, elaborating a kind of sociology of myth.

The study of the interconnectedness between the two main levels of this topology, i.e., between logos and myth, buried the concept of rationality and the notion of "progress" at the very first stage. According to G. Durand, it turns out that the latter are nothing other than a rationalization of the myth of Prometheus. The next step was the discovery that Logos itself, as the axial destiny of Western European culture (from Plato through Descartes to positivism) was but a special edition of myth (an "ascendental myth" in G. Bachelard's theory or the "diurnal regime", "le diurne" in Durand's theory). This is the discovery of deep sociology (the sociology of the imagination) based on the structuralism of C. Levi-Strauss, the history of religion (H. Corben, M. Eliade), psychoanalysis (C.G. Jung), reflexology (M. Bekhterev), modern physics and mathematics (R. Tohm, V. Pauli etc.). This opened a completely different view of the essence, content, meaning, nature and quality of social processes. Classical sociology, which had detected numerous failures of logos in society (for example, the principle of "heterotellie" - a sociological law that states that social processes almost always attain goals other than those they set to begin with, thus overturning the cause-and-effect logic in which the founding fathers of sociology - the positivists Kant and Durkheim - so firmly believed) came through deep sociology to form a consistent and semantically complete system. The enormous methodological and documentary material accumulated by the classical sociologists thus started to be interpreted in an entirely new way.

Thus, by the end of the 20th century, a "two-level sociology" was established in which research on the social logos was paralleled by studies of the "social underground" ("social dungeon") and "social myth." In other words, the "social unconscious" was discovered.

Social logos

By his profession, a sociologist is called to look beyond "public opinion", "common ideas", and "common sense", i.e., those beliefs and ideas that circulate among the masses in their "majority" and constitute the framework of "conventional wisdom". "Public opinion" never reflects the whole picture. Its natural place is situated in the space between scientific truth and that which is a pure chimera, or nothing. Even Plato, in his *The Republic*, defined "opinion" (δόξα) as showing us something while at the same time hiding something else from us, in all cases revealing to us not that which lies on the surface of conveying, but somewhere else, thus always deceiving us. More straightforward American experts on

financial speculation and stock markets have formulated the same law in rougher terms: "the majority is always wrong".

In analyzing "opinion", sociologists derive from such the half-manifested and half-hidden truth, and thus explain the mechanism and, in turn, semantic structure of lies (silence, euphemisms, projections, transposition, and other rhetorical tropes). It is thus the sum of extracted scientific truths, clarifications, and etiologies of misconceptions and lies - the content of the social logos - that constitutes the object of classical sociology.

The pessimism of the classical sociologists: Logos on the brink of catastrophe

The majority of the classical sociologists' major reconstructions ("grand theories") were marked by the disturbing nature of social processes in the 20th century. The very idea of "progress", which has become something taken for granted in "public opinion", was at a certain moment recognized to be a euphemism designed to brighten up premonitions of impending disaster.

Most sociologists, and Pitirim Sorokin in particular, unanimously emphasized the hedonistic, material, sensual, and sensate nature of modern Western civilization, and this quality affected the "social logos" all the more profoundly over the course of the 20th century. Material values, entailing an "obsession with economics", the search for egoistic, material freedom and pleasure, came to the forefront and undermined, eroded the structure of society's rational organization. Almost all sociologists predicted in one way or another that the social logos of the West and all of world civilization having come under decisive Western influence, threatens disaster.

This feeling especially intensified in the postmodern era, when many began to speak of the "society of the spectacle" (G. Debord), the "order of simulacra" (J. Baudrillard), or the "end of history" (F. Fukuyama). Indeed, Fukuyama spoke of a "society of gaps", increasing "fragmentation of social ties", etc. The social logos had disintegrated in front of our very own eyes, transforming into something else ascertained only with great difficulty and demanding new sociological methods for understanding and explaining it.

Some, such as Castells, have timidly suggested that logos does not die, but moves on to a new form of existence as a network. But this did not and does not sound very convincing. In any case, starting at the end of the 20th century, classical society stood at the threshold of, as the optimists say, a fundamental, qualitative metamorphosis or, as the pessimists (such as Spengler) suspected, collapse.

The social moment through the eyes of deep sociologists: Slipping into the night

Even more alerted by the exhaustion of modernity are deep sociologists, who have in principle believed that reassessing logos in view of myth amounts to a disaster, which by definition and from the very onset is fraught with collapse and colossal inflation of the logos. Being no opponents of logos, they merely point out that the gigantic endeavor of reassessing one half of society (the diurnal half) is fraught with the possibility of rapid regression and falling into the opposite extreme, the regions of the unconscious, with no easing up or intermediate stages. They rightly considered the European totalitarianisms of the 20th century to be such a rapid drop towards myth, i.e., the Nazi regime (with its "Myth of the 20th Century" which, admittedly, is rather a pale and pitiful parody of myth itself) and the USSR with its chiliastic attempt at building a "paradise on earth" (the diachronic-trinitarian myth of Joachim de Flora skipped over by Hegel, and specifically Russian, cultic messianism).

But the inflation of logos did not cease with the victory over fascism or following the end of communism. In the 1990's arose the temporary illusion that the social logos had at last found its final incarnation in the liberal-democratic American paradigm (hence globalism and the "end of history") which would last forever (as the American neocons tried to inaugurate with the "Project for a New American Century" and theories of "benevolent hegemony" and "benevolent empire"). In the 2000's, all of this became increasingly doubtful. When the financial crisis of 2008 hit and the black Democrat Barack Obama came to power in the US, it became clear that the preceding round was not the establishment of a "new world order", but the final agony of the Western-centric logos.

From the standpoint of deep sociologists, the point at hand was the collision of two myths that had acted for three centuries in the "dungeon" of Western European societies (and those that came under their influence).

The modern era and the Enlightenment reflected the rise of the myth of Prometheus, who inspired both the rationalists and romantics, the people of day and the poets of night. The titan, trickster, deceiver of the gods (night), Prometheus, acting as Faust and Lucifer, brings people fire and knowledge (day). Schelling, Hugo, Hegel, Marx, and both liberals and socialists were inspired by the myth of Prometheus. Even in fascism, through the Nietzschean lens of the "Superman" and Wagnerianism, Prometheus found peculiar expression.

But with the end of the 19th century, Prometheus began to give way to the myth of Dionysus. Emanating from decadent salons, he penetrated culture and subsequently became the main myth of

people engaged in media (and, as a rule, dropouts, drunks, perverts and drug addicts, as Durand aptly noted), cinema, and later television, intellectuals, and artists - typical people of the night in practically all societies. Gradually imbued with the individualist-hedonistic style of "journalists", inveterate skeptics, and the opponents of all rational organization (enemies of the social logos), society became a society of entertainment and enjoyment, the "society of the spectacle."

Dionysus displaced Prometheus, the end of the whose myth is described in Andre Gide's splendid, ironic book, *Prometheus III-Bound*. But Dionysus himself gradually lost his appeal, momentum, and energy as the decadent perversions of the elite, bearing something stylistically attractive, turned into the disgusting rot of the decaying masses sliding into the night. Plebeian gay parades turned the refined atmosphere of Oscar Wilde's salons, the solar insanity of Arthur Rambo, and the poetic gesture of Kuzmin's Apollon into plebeian kitsch (yet another instance of the significance of the expression "don't throw pearls before swine"). The myth of Dionysus in turn reached the point of saturation and became one of the sources of freshness of the stagnant, stympalian swamp.

The cycle of Western culture has come to an end. Postmodernity with its epiphenomena is a convincing illustration of this.

At any rate, sociologists of the depths are awaiting a new myth (perhaps they hope that this will be the balanced and integrative myth of Hermes - such as the Eranos group which included Jung, Eliade, Bachelard, Corben, Dumezil, Scholem, and Durand), but they clearly understand that the European logos is about to finally slip off into the night. Frankly speaking, it seems to me rather doubtful that these wonderful people, these neo-Hermeticists, will manage to stop that which is falling, much less shift this fall...

Jung's topology

The preceding observations were necessary in order to arrive at the main topic, i.e., our attempt at conceiving what awaits humanity once postmodernity finally comes into its own and the social logos finally perishes into the night of the myth. In other words, we are interested in reconstructing the picture of the impending sociological dimension taking into account those structural, semantic meanings which we (or not) must survive (or not). On the basis of a sociological reconstruction of classical and non-classical theories, we can construct different models of the future, basing ourselves on the psychoanalytical topology of Jung, who preoccupied himself with the fate of man and attempted to as impartially as possible describe the fullness of the human factor in its various dimensions at different stages. Before "painting" the "sociology of the Apocalypse" with "Jung's paint", let us recall the main parameters of his topology.

According to Jung, a human being is a complex system consisting of several poles, the main of which are “ego”, “persona”, “anima/animus”, “shadow”, and Selbst (“self”). Let us add Freud’s “superego” for the sake of completeness.

My “I” and my mask

Man is considered to be a rational individual who calls himself “I”. In psychoanalysis, this function is denoted by the Latin term “ego”, whose properties are intellect, capacity for mental operations, the possession of logical structures (or “proto-logical” ones like among so-called primitive tribes” and “savages”), capacity for self-reflection and clear separation of oneself (“ego”) from the outside world, “others”, and “the other.”

The generalized social logos is the collective projection of the “ego”, what Freud called the “superego” or “super-I.” The “ego” always correlates to the “superego”, which thus gives rise to a system of social norms and determines a large part of the being of “I.”

In regards to other social “I” and the aggregate social logos (superego), the ego acts as the persona, personality, or mask. A gap exists between the ego and personality which consists of the “ego” having another dimension, reversed into itself, which distinguishes it from the personality or “persona” through a fully exhaustive socio-logical function. The ego has a psyche, while a persona does not (such is carefully hidden and ignored). The psyche of the ego makes itself known only when a persona begins to behave or feel inappropriately within society or in the face of the superego given as a standard in morality and the rules of thinking (a mental disorder).

“I” usually appears to be alone as a result of the reflection of the logos on the physical separateness of the human body. But this is not necessary, Jung emphasizes. The deformation of logical structures, a lowering of mental level (*abaissement du niveau mental*) or simply dreaming can easily blur the singularity of “I”, its identity, and scatter into various fractions the “alter-ego.” In some instances of psychosis, this manifests itself through voices, through sight, or even through visions of one’s self. In some cases, several “egos” can form a fairly stable form of identity (such as in Stevenson’s Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde).

Jung’s “I” is not a constant once and for all, but is plural. Sometimes Jung speaks of the ego as one part of a complex psyche alongside other “complexes.”

The realm of the collective unconscious and Selbst

Within the “ego” begins the space of the psyche containing different layers, some close to the “ego” (such as memory, subjective assessment of actions, and “invasion” from below) and those further away from it, such as the unconscious.

Freud called the unconscious “es” or “id.” He himself restricted the unconscious to individual feelings and instincts formed as a rule during infancy and even in the prenatal period. In Jung’s famous dream of 1909 in which he travelled across the Atlantic by ship with his teacher, he saw that in the unconscious there is an even deeper level which ceases to be individual, and becomes collective. The realm of the collective unconscious is the center of Jung’s conceptualized topology.

The collective unconscious, according to Jung, is all the same for everyone and is inhabited by eternal myths and archetypes. This collective unconscious is explained by stable plots of certain dreams (great dreams), myths, stories, fairy tales, religious visions, and artistic works. The properly perceived, integrated, embraced, accepted, and sacredly exalted collective unconscious directed above to the light at the surface is what Jung terms Selbst or “self.”

Animus/anima and the dark double

Furthermore, between the ego and collective unconscious exist two of the main intermediate instances: the animus/anima (the soul that Jung divides by gender) and the “shadow” (umbra, die Schatten).

Animus/anima (like Balzac’s Seraphitus and Seraphita) is an image of the collective unconscious as it appears in pure form in the male or female ego. Over the course of his research (including clinical studies), Jung noted that men steadily imagine the “unconscious” (“es” and “id”) as feminine (hence “anima”, the feminine soul), while women imagine such to be the male (hence “animus”, the masculine soul). In Russian, it would be tempting to use the cognate words *dusha* (“soul”) and *dukh* (“spirit”), but they have a steadily different meaning (although one could ask: do either of them have any meaning at all today?).

There is also the “shadow” representing the dark twin of the ego which consists of negative products of the dialogue between the ego and the collective unconscious. All that the diurnal mind represses, rules out, represses, pushes out, censors, and does not cognize in the impulses rising from the unconscious

depths, makes up the “shadow”, shaping its structure and a kind of “anti-persona” (symmetrically opposite to a persona). The devil is the generalized form of the shadow.

Individuation as the realization of Selbst

Of great importance in Jung’s works is the subject of “individuation.” Individuation is the harmonious, balanced, incremental and measured transfer of the collective unconscious’ structures to the level of the logos. A correctly oriented human life is the realization of Selbst, i.e., individuation. Only in this case, the ego serves the purpose of letting what lies on the level of the myth out into the realm of logos.

Jung clarified the relationship between given instances in his topology, supplied nuances, explained details, and solved the puzzles of their dialectical relations. He delineated the dialectic of this structure in his patients and in works of art, religious doctrines, philosophical theories, famous biographies, and in the prejudices of average citizens. Practically all of his creative work was devoted to this end.

Sociology of the imagination

Applying Jung’s topology to society (with certain adjustments) yields deep sociology or the sociology of the imagination as developed mainly by R. Bastide and G. Durand. The social logos (Durkheim’s “public consciousness”) is the generalized ego (superego). At the other extreme is the collective unconscious (or social unconscious). Between them is the human ego facing society through its personality (persona) and facing the collective unconscious (the nighttime realm of myths) through its psyche and its figures (the anima, animus, and shadow).

Between the collective consciousness and collective unconscious exists a dynamic insofar as they resonate in certain issues and are homologous, while in some cases enter into discord and conflict. This is due to social kinetics (including mobility) and the deep content of social processes. The individual or human is a point in this complex two-stage dialectic of night and day, or diurne and nocturne.

Pitirim Sorokin’s tripartite model of social topology, which distinguishes between three types of societies and social structures (the ideational, idealistic, and sensual) on the grounds of a purely heuristic approach, is given firm ground in Durand’s three archetypal structures - the “heroic”, “cyclical”, and “mystical”, which are a direct mythological homologue to Sorokin’s sociological constructs. Durand’s school, the Center for Research on the Imaginary, has in the 50 years of its existence produced an enormous amount of hermeneutic work on “mytho-analyzing” sociological systems and the “mytho-criticism” of literary works or historical records.

Dreaming the world

Now on to the economic crisis. Above we said that it is highly probable that the current financial crisis is an expression of a much deeper process, i.e., the decline of the social logos blurred or saturated with sensual moments (a la Sorokin) or the Dionysian myth which has been overtaken by the osculating masses (a la Durand). In Jung's system, this process can be seen as the "lowering of the mental level" (abaissement du niveau mental). Let us assume that the logical structures of the ego and superego were to crumble at a critical threshold - and this is highly likely if we take into account observations on Russian society, which has rapidly degraded in the intellectual and moral sense, as well as processes taking place in Western culture and politics. In this case, we should expect humanity to plunge head first into the night regime.

In Jungian topology, this means that we have descended into the collective unconscious. This is not simply nihilism. The very concept of nothing, or nihil, belongs to the order of logical structures capable of abstractly representing pure negativity in contrast to pure presence. But insofar as logic is eroded, the crystal-clear nothingness of logical nihilism appears to us not as empty, but filled with elusive meanings, inconsistent pictures, and cacophonous sounds arranged disharmoniously. The nihilism of night is full of sounds, colors, and shapes, but only from the standpoint of the day. This is nothingness.

We will begin to see the critical points enumerated below in darkness. After all, there are always objects that are darker than others. It is at this point that we have arrived at the Jungian version of post-crisis futurology.

The social logos has fallen. Despite having successfully defeated all of its logical and ideological competitors (theocracy, monarchy, fascism, and communism), liberalism has not coped with the burden of the social logos, i.e., it is incapable of defending the order of the day all on its own against the night closing in on it from all sides and from within. The last such attempt was the American neocons' imperial adventure. Meanwhile, the previous logoi are left hopelessly repudiated and distraught.

The diurnal character of liberalism is relative. Perhaps it won precisely because it offered the softest of all orders, the most unobtrusive logos, the most compromising and tolerant instrument of daytime repression of the nocturnal unconscious. But now it has perforce been left one-on-one in the face of chaos - the very same chaos which it relied upon earlier.

If the current economic crisis (for liberal civilization, economics is a substitute for order and logos) turns out to be the last, then a fundamental "lowering of the mental level of humanity" will take place. The world will be plunged into a dream.

Just what kind of dream will this be?

Post-anthropology's new actors

The scrapping of the "ego" and "superego", their overturning into the dark haze of psychosis, leads to the emergence of new actors in the forefront. These actors will be neither classes (as in communism) nor races (as in National-Socialism) nor even the individual (as in liberalism) - all of these social ideologies were founded on specific logical systems and, parallel to such, on rather distinguishable nocturnally structured myths. These actors will be the shapes of the unconscious left over from the epoch of the luminous domination of logos. This will be a post-logos order that will lead to the introduction of post-anthropology.

The main figures in the relationship between the ego and the unconscious will acquire autonomy and become the ego's substitute. Humanity will hear "voices."

The fact that modern man's ego will become dynamic, plural, game-like, and random can already be seen everywhere - in the constant changing of professions, moving (the new nomadism), changing genders, nick-names, the appearance of doubles and clones (first in literature, films, and computer games, but tomorrow in practice). Such will become commonplace as life acquires more of an ironic, game-like nature. The cycle will shrink as families, partners, friends, countries, and occupations are changed with kaleidoscopic speed. People will change their gender all the more often, and sex-change operations will come to be more than a one time affair - one is a woman, has enough, becomes a man, then a woman again, and so on. But after a certain point - we will hardly notice it - the notion of individual identity itself will dissolve and the principle of freedom will corrode the "totalitarian shackles" of individuality. In the human atom separate components will be "discovered" - electrons, protons, quarks which will demand for themselves "new freedoms" (as the Belgian writer Jean Ray anticipated in his *The Hand of Götz von Berlichingen*).

And it is at this moment that we will face a series of very interesting phenomena and advents which will define the panorama of the post-anthropological landscape.

The coming of the shadow

The “shadow” will be one of the main actors of the “Jungian Apocalypse.” Fantasies of living shadows (in Anderson’s works and popular folklore) are a famous tale repeatedly surfacing in literature, theater, and opera. “Shadow” is a synonym for the devil, and we can say that this image coincides with the wide and varying descriptions of the Antichrist or the “coming of Satan.” Jung’s perspective differs from religious, theological views on this subject in that he examines the figure of the devil - in the spirit of Origen Adamantius’ “Apocatastasis” - as relatively negative. According to Jung, in the “shadow-devil” accumulates all that has been discarded by the ego over the course of unsuccessful individuation, i.e., over the course of the translation of the collective unconscious and its archetypes in the sphere of the logos. Thus, the devil is not independent or primordial, but merely symbolizes the totality of human failures and the results of friction with the “sueprego” which is in turn associated not so much with individual errors as with dissonance and the conflict of the social logos (including religious and moral aspects) with the mythological complex lying beneath the foundations of society. The shadow is failed Selbst. After all, the devil was once an angel of light who fell...

The shadow which will reveal itself in the near future should not necessarily be regarded as only the “devil” of the Christian religion. In social and psychoanalytic terms, this will simply be a “residue”, some kind of surrogate of a disappearing “I”, and in the face of the undifferentiated collective unconscious, this figure will seem like “salvational straw” which, as it pertains to its identification, will be higher than the mythological chaos swimming down below. Therefore, for post-humanity the “shadow”, as an image preserved from the lost “ego”, will present itself as a kind of temptation. The shadow will not act as an enemy of humanity (especially since man will by this time give way to post-man). Rather, it will act as an enemy of the undifferentiated abyss of indistinguishable dreams.

What will this “shadow” be in its coming? This is difficult to imagine since the social landscape will change significantly. The collapse of the logos will not cancel science, or more precisely technology, hence the dissolution of the individual might very well be combined with the continuation of technological progress by inertia. Therefore, the shadow will come in the entourage of machines and devices. But it will not be a singular human being or group of beings. It will be something resembling a cloud, fog, a thinking nebula which can assume various identities, names, and types. These images will be somewhat vague, as if covered in fog. The shadow will hardly appear in the form of monsters, but rather in the form of memories and languid and dense dreams.

This is one pole.

Operation Alraune

Another figure of the Jungian Apocalypse will be the disincarnate female anima. This will not be a human female, but femininity in its collective, apparitional aspect.

Here it is worth dwelling on the idea of the anima in Jung's works in more detail. Jung's anima is not an image of a woman based on animal instinct or lustful observation of the female sex, and not even on genetic memory as Freudism and materialist psychology present such. It is the creation of a purely male ego which, through the anima, structures both itself and relations with the internal other (which is the same), proceeding to project this relation outwards on the other and itself now within the framework of form - this is woman in a social-gender sense.

The male ego does not know anything about the female ego, and does not want nor can it know nothing about it. It merely projects a living image, in which it is appealed to by the collective unconscious ("es"), onto the surrounding socio-biological matter. The internal anima and external woman are for the male ego (logos) strictly one and the same. The anima is primary and that which does not coincide with anime in a woman is either not noticed, rejected, censored, or hated by the male ego. All of this has been tracked by psychoanalysts in millions of examples.

If the male anima is drawn to the figure of the Melusine (the water-inhabiting fairy-fish-woman with a tail and no genitals), then a mismatch in external women in relation to this standard will be presented as their fault, and not as the fault of the image (in which, in fact, there is nothing pathological - after all, such is harmoniously and tightly woven into the sacred lexicon of great dreams).

Parallel research has been conducted by Levi-Strauss in studying the structure of kinship. In the myths of many American tribes as well as other peoples of Africa and Melanesia or, more broadly, the whole world, the theme of a "proper scale of marriage" is recurrent. In order to show what is correct, a myth shows what is incorrect. There are countless, stable motifs concerning marriage with animals (Masha and the bear etc.), spirits, demons and angels (the Book of Enoch), objects, monsters, and so on. These are too distant of relationships, which means that the ego swung too far across the horizons of the unconscious and, as a rule, legends warn that nothing good comes out of this.

Too close of a kinship is represented by incest, a taboo which rests at the heart of all known social structures with only the rarest exceptions (such as Zoroastrianism which legalized and even proscribed incest; and in the practice of Jewish Sabbatist sects in Turkey - see M. Maffesoli). In relation to the anima, this means that the ego has come too close to the collective unconscious, which is fraught with dissolution or could in place of such introduce its own "egotistical" projections leading to sterility or the

generation of monsters, i.e., to flowing into the realm of the shadow. The shadow is the totality of those taboos which man has been tempted to violate.

Herein arises a question: From where does the male ego come? Different sociologists, philosophers, and psychologists have offered different answers. The Marxist sociologist Bourdieu, for example, believes that gender is a purely social phenomenon, i.e., the ego is endowed with a male quality exclusively by society - the dictatorship of the "superego" - and in practice through education and the structuring of family relations. According to Bourdieu, if a boy is raised and treated as a girl, he will be a girl, and his ego and persona will be fully-fledged feminine in personality. On this is based contemporary "gender tolerance" and the Western interpretation of human rights, in which man (as the classic of liberalism, Locke, affirmed) is a tabula rasa upon which society writes all that it pleases. Marx also thought so.

In any case, it can be assumed that it is not the gender of a soul (anima-animus) that depends on whether the ego is male or female, but on the contrary - a soul's gender via a converse logic determines the gender identity of the ego. Anima leads to the ego being masculine in order to make the process of individuation harmonious, i.e., its coming out into the light of the logos. Conversely, the animus extrapolates itself in the region of the logical through the feminine ego in order to exercise the whole, same individuation. Let us note that all of these considerations apply only to Jung's theory, according to which a soul has a gender.

At any rate, comprehending the particular autonomy of the soul imbued with gender allows us to visualize the figure of Anima who will probably meet us over the course of the global financial crisis. This femininity "without women" or "apart from women" might very well appear through a series of archetypes which will either diachronically or synchronously manifest themselves in the form of giant female figures, dark, ugly and old women, fairies, Undine, nymphs, and salamanders, or in the form of female elements directly such as water and earth. The plastic fantasy of the decaying social logos yields technical or virtual forms. However, it is unimportant whether these figures of Anima will appear by means of malfunction in the process of cloning or as a result of the development of the visual illusions of the totalitarian screen. Most important in this is not the technology of the phenomenon of Anima, but its philosophical meaning. The social logos has in the last millennium been predominantly masculine. In decomposing, it will spill out the final female fantasy just as, according to legend, the seed dropped by the hanged man yields the mandragora or Alraune (see the wonderful novel by Hanns Heinz Ewers, *Alraune*).

When we think of femininity without women, we want to emphasize just how the anima is associated with the male ego, and this means that the post-anthropological pole of anima will likely be tied to

disappearing men and their sinking “I” rather than women who, from the logical point of view, will be relegated to a specific existential niche. We shall now consider just what kind of niche this will be.

Animus

If anima is the product of the pure male ego, then animus is the product of the purely female. The man who constitutes the woman’s dream, i.e., the male form of “es”, has never existed and does not exist. This is not the male ego, but something quite different altogether. Prince charming, the noble knight, the hero - the woman gives birth to and populates culture with them. Woman created man. In the literal sense, she gave birth to him. Figuratively, she invented him. Man was thought up by woman in three forms - as the baby, the hero, and the wise old teacher. These are the three instances of the unconscious. Puer ludens, homunculus, Lilliputian, the playing and laughing child - these are intimations of the unconscious which the female ego is capable of embracing, understanding, and encompassing. The heroic husband is the unconscious in the form with which existential battle can be waged to stake their existence (since real men who would deserve this simply do not exist). Finally, the elderly teacher is the unconscious in the form of death which captures the dynamic of the female ego and freezes it into the ice of eternity. Such men live only in the psyche of the woman and from there appear in works of art. Talented feminized artists read the thin folds of women’s dreams and bring them into culture. And only from there, as patterns, do they assume their male ego, entirely different in structure and style, conforming to social norms, the dictatorship of the “superego” and maintain the status of persona.

The weakening of the pressure of culture leads to men turning into what we see around us today from which the female ego recoils in disgust. These are today’s snotty, screaming babies, swine, filthy (in the best case), cowardly, and greedy men, and the old and rude who have accumulated over their whole lifetime only strife and bad habits. The social projections of the female spirit earlier weaved together images of heroic men and imposed such as the standard. When this work was weakened in a segment of the social logos for which female personalities were responsible in the era of patriarchy, then everything collapsed. Only strange and untidy beings of non-traditional orientations remain - freaks and geeks. Patriarchy was a product of the extrapolation of the female fantasy.

So who will Animus be without men?

This will be the figure of the final release of female energy, the solar hero, the “superman” - innocent like a child, cruel as a man, and wise as an elder. Feminine dialogue with the unconscious will yield the final volley of erotic energy in a flying, golden figure. It will be ephemeral and quickly dissolve since, given the absence of social order (on the surface of which the leftover residue will swim in the likes of traffic police, who will easily survive the disappearance of sense and logic in things), Animus will have

nothing through which to secure its will to power. This will be the flash of the absolute dawn of metaphysical "fascism" which will show itself on the horizon only to melt away into the impending night in a flash.

However, who knows, perhaps even the momentary contemplation of the birth and disappearance of Animus will be a spectacle which, in an illusory manner, will satisfy great female expectations.

The Radical Subject

Yet another figure will have its place in the post-crisis (anti)utopia. This time, this personage is not from the arsenal of Jungian topology, but from the post-philosophical intuitions of "new metaphysics." This is the Radical Subject described schematically in my books *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, *Post-Philosophy*, and *The Radical Subject and its Double*. While not being a Jungian figure, it can nevertheless be described in the terms of the "Jungian Apocalypse."

The Radical Subject is the realization of the outburst of the collective unconscious' archetypes into the light of day along a model differing from that of the social and cultural logos which dominated in the cycle of known human civilization. The Radical Subject is the alternative logos (or more precisely, the logos in potentiality bearing a number of logoi) which shares with the hitherto known logos its diurnal nature, but which belongs to the collective unconscious and mythological foundation of society (culture, civilization) in a different fashion. Compared to this, the genesis of the former (old) logos out of mythos was questionable in the very beginning, if not fatally wrong.

From the philosophical point of view, the theory closest to this model is Heidegger's "Ereignis" which he developed from 1936 to 1944.

The Radical Subject is capable of individuation under any circumstances insofar as it operates with logos not as an actuality, but with logos as a potentiality, i.e., in the sphere which lies between the collective unconscious (mythos) and its concentration in the actuality of the logos - before this concentration becomes irreversible.

This is the dissolved logos, the proto-logos. The Radical Subject is the realization of Selbst in its unconditional form free of all circumstances, and the psyche does not participate in such realization

since we are dealing (according to Jung and Otto) with the numinous horizons of the spirit in pure form beyond psychic waters, a kind of “dry path.”

The final composition

The writer Mamleev once wrote in the title of one of his stories: “We are ready for the Second Coming.” That is right.

What will be the combination of the poles of post-anthropology?

Theoretically, and following formal symmetries, there will be four dynamic post-identities that are relatively autonomous - the shadow, anima, animus, and the Radical Subject. It can be assumed that the “shadow-devil” will try to expand its field to the maximally available extent, i.e., against the anima, animus, and Radical Subject.

Just how the re-doubling of the Radical Subject will happen, i.e., the establishment of its diabolical simulacrum - I’ve tried to describe this in my book *The Radical Subject and its Double* in which with “double” we have in mind strictly that which Jung refers to as the “shadow”, only in the apocalyptic and sociological perspective which we are now examining - the shadow of the macrocosm, not micro-psychology. To summarize this book in a single phrase: distinguishing the Radical Subject from its double will be difficult, and in this lies the metaphysical nerve of the whole drama of the world (the world was created in the light of the telos of this final discernment).

The valence of the relationship between the shadow and Radical Subject will, among other things, lend the shadow a metaphysical value, and out of this inertial residue of the scattering logos will turn it into a “socially” significant figure. Here, incidentally, is quite pertinent the theological model of understanding the devil who, unlike Jung’s psychological pragmatism (and his reliance on the Gnostics) forms in relation to this character the proper proportions of reaction, fight, and flight (if at such a point anyone is still “making up their mind”, then by now their mind is not simply “not theirs”, but disappears altogether like smoke).

The golden Animus, taking off from the periphery of the female horizon in the glow of absolute (never former) fascism, will probably have no relation whatsoever to Anima or the shadow. To the shadow it is inaccessible for in it the female ego is liberated from itself, its own sin, its own shadow. The female ego

is the shadow. But what, then, is the male ego? Perhaps just a misunderstanding? How the Radical Subject relates to the disincarnate Animus is not clear yet. And will it ever have any meaning for it?...

Now the shadow is definitely trying to seize the liquid Anima, include it in its structure, perhaps by the inertia of memory. As modern physics knows, even material substances have memory. The shadow will see the post-anthropological symmetry with its female ego disappearing into nowhere.

Yet another, fifth, element will be the background, which can only be described as the "return of the ancient gods" (Heidegger's formula), the rise of the collective unconscious or hell in its etymological form, as the invisible (Hades) becomes visible (idea, form). In the absence of a repressing logos, all myths will rise up together without any diachronical control or any order (Ordnung). Christian consciousness can also safely relate to this as religion demands. In a moral, strictly religious sense, temptation should have no power or force over saved man if evil does not in one moment assume ambiguous features that form a spiritual and moral choice - for the discernment of spirits is a truly heroic challenge and great feat - and not taking itself for granted as socio-cultural banality. When evil comes in the guise of evil, it is not so difficult to reject. When it comes forth as something incomprehensible and overwhelming all at once, then taking a strict position is much more difficult. Everything spins and falls out of place, and it is impossible to distinguish one thing from the other. This is vigorous and effective evil.

Will this happen?

It necessarily will, since, on the one hand, such a scenario has in general terms been written down in the sacred texts of humanity, while on the other hand, modern sociology, cultural studies, philosophy, and analytical psychology have in their own languages and terminologies come to a more or less similar view. It certainly will, and precisely as it has been described. The question is when exactly?

Every failure in the history of civilization, every great war, natural disaster, bloody revolution, and mad cycle of cultural, political, social, economic, and technological development can potentially mean the collapse of the social logos, which has clearly and sufficiently long since achieved its saturation and passed through the main stages of its journey. The social logos has already "born, married, and died." This had become obvious by the time of Nietzsche. Heidegger, Spengler, and in a wider sense most of Germany's conservative revolutionaries in the 1920's and '30's were living exclusively with the feeling of this end.

The Russian Revolution rode this very same wave, at least as poets, philosophers, and the artists of the Silver Age understood it (and they were the only ones to understand it correctly). The proposal that the proletariat recognize itself as a class identity (especially in the 1920's), A. Planatov's literature, and Klyuev, Blok, and Mayakovsky's poetry had already anticipated the post-anthropological movement of disembodied, de-humanized energies. Blok's *Rus-Sofia is Anima*. Klyuev described in detail the geography of the collective unconscious with the thoroughness of a German zoologist or surveyor. Mayakovsky created a poetic ontology of class beings. Platonov explained how being lives and works through the luminous communes, as his heroes eat the earth (like the character Chevengur who calls himself "God"), transform into Dostoevsky, and ravishly and voluptuously harm the reality of Rosa Luxemburg and the world revolution.

If we peer deeper into history, then what Rus lived through in the age of the schism and Europe during the Reformation can very well be attributed to the same category. The world ended, the social logos cracked and toppled, and out from underneath the rubble crawled the giant figures of the untamed subconscious.

There have been no few repetitions of the current crisis, and humanity is culturally ready for such. The swindling which we call "modernity" with its chimeras and emptiness will sooner or later end. Thus, everything will happen, happen soon, and happen precisely so. Sure, we have not described how, because we see everything as open and are preparing to participate.

And still there is the likelihood that this bursting bubble is not the last (or the next to last). Heidegger metaphysically pondered: "We live close to the point of midnight - no, it seems not yet - always the eternal 'not yet'..."

But no matter how frustrated expectations for a quick outcome might be, this does not mean that there will never be an end. It might be delayed, but look around. Everything bears its signs. Perhaps it will be postponed once again, will blow over, and the scum will once again rejoice and stir, feeling that this time it is "still not yet..." We could allow for this, but then again, maybe it won't be postponed. Even if it were, one must live - already today - as if it will not be postponed. And when we will truly live, fixed on the post-anthropological outcome, living within it itself and perhaps anticipating its events, then everything will happen .

It will, it necessarily will.

Translated by Jafe Arnold

POST-MEN OR POST-HUMANS?

[Twitter](#) [VK](#) [Odnoklassniki](#) [Blogger](#) [LiveJournal](#) [Email](#) [Print](#) [Share](#)

PHILOSOPHY

Post-men or post-humans?

22.03.2023

Alexander Dugin

When a man stops being a man, he does not become a woman. When a man stops being a man, he does not become a beast.

Here the matter is very complicated. He who betrays his own sex falls below the critical line, the boundary that demarcates both sexes.

The post-male betrays both sexes simultaneously. We are dealing with a monster, a dangerous and unpredictable degenerate, who is not a 'woman' at all, even to think so is an insult.

With a woman, however, it is a little different. The true structure of her gender is peculiar and poorly understood, and concepts such as loyalty/ betrayal (which describe the male attitude quite clearly) do not apply directly to her. There is (should be) a special language to describe women and their logic, a secret, or as yet undiscovered, language. There are no post-women. They were invented by post-men, and there are no feminists, there are victims of a dangerous and cynical experiment. They are simply pitied, like the lame crow.

There are post-men and they are to blame for what they do and what they become. Everything around them begins to rot, to decay, to slide into dissolution. When they are few, they may still have a place in culture: in exotic marginality, eccentricity, extravagance, but as soon as post-masculinity becomes a serious trend, it turns into a highly contagious deadly virus. If given free rein, they will destroy everything around them.

Something similar happens to those who lose their human image. Here it is even more evident. Such people do not turn into beasts: beasts, even if predatory or repulsive, are organic, harmonious and never do anything that is not justified and predestined by their nature. In this they are beautiful, even

when they are extremely dangerous or annoying. We recognise this by respecting animals, both domestic and wild. Post-humans, on the other hand, are very different. they cut ties with our archetype, but they do not enter into an ontological contract with beasts. Man cannot become a beast, that is beyond his powers, and above all he does not and cannot have the innocence inherent in every beast. That is why post-human beings are also monsters, perverts and degenerates. In ancient times they were called 'chimeras' or 'sheddim'. There is a version that they are the ancestors of monkeys, but monkeys are harmonious, organic and fascinating. I believe this version is false. Let us not offend the apes.

Post-humans undermine the human being just as post-humans undermine sex - sex as such. Post-humans, by giving in to humans, are also doing irreparable damage to the nature of beasts.

Environmentalists (mainly deep ecologists in the spirit of steampunk or cyber-feminism, Donna Haraway's Cthulhuzen) are a type of post-human. Unable to be human, they try to become mice or jackdaws, but in doing so insult rodents and birds. Environmentalists are enemies of animals and hide the face of subverted maniacs under the guise of animal protectors.

Today's liberals are mainly made up of post-humans and post-men. Liberalism is a kind of post-ideology in which thought, idea and morality have all fallen below the critical line, which is why modern liberals attach so much importance to gender politics and deep ecology. They are dragging humanity into the ocean of full-throttle degeneration. If they need a nuclear war to create monsters of cellophane waste, algae and computer circuits, sooner or later they will. What is in the mind of a sodomite or a digital environmentalist is beyond the criteria of normality. Hence the mutations imposed by global elites through the infosphere, comedians, virtuality, social media, drugs, the modern urban lifestyle (urbanism is one of the most important tools of forced mass degeneration).

Consider this: in Georgia, a moderate government proposed a foreign agent law, just like in the US. The foreign agents immediately rebelled because they feared they would not be the only ones to decide who is an agent and who is not. The same is true for the post-men and women: having seized power, they themselves impose the criteria of what is the norm, what is woke and what is not, and what should be abolished (deleted). Today, what was the gender norm in many European countries yesterday is already a crime, tomorrow the violation of the rights of a computer or a spectator ant could be grounds for outright imprisonment, and the loudest cries about human rights come from those who hate human beings. Likewise, feminism is just an aggressive and extremist version of radical misogyny. The situation is complicated by the fact that the next turning point in history requires a true apology of man (of gender in general) and of the human being as such, in order to remain at least where we are.

Today, however, this is exactly what is categorically forbidden by the elites, even in our society, so much so that post-humans and post-humans have taken root there, and contrary to the 'traditional values' enshrined in Decree No. 809, liberals still dominate in Russia as the legislators of the dominant paradigm, the episteme. In fact, the Russian elite is directly sabotaging the President's decisions on a return to normality and without this reversal, there can be no real apology.

This is what we are facing at the moment. We are at war with a liberal, globalist civilisation, but we remain almost entirely under its ideological control. The war is in its second year and there is total sabotage, contrary to what the President has said and done. That is the problem. Perhaps it is not a question of how to win, but how to start a real war.

War is an affair of men. War is an affair of men. First of all, both must be justified and put the other in his place.

Seek the man! Seek the man, that is what we must absolutely do.

But do you hear how disturbing that sounds?! We already have mental programmes built into us that do not even allow us to think in this direction and they are working. We are actively and intensely demasculinated and dehumanised and those who resist are relegated to the margins, to the obscurantists, branded with the most disgusting labels and then killed.

Translation by Lorenzo Maria Pacini

[Twitter](#) [VK](#) [Odnoklassniki](#) [Blogger](#) [LiveJournal](#) [Email](#) [Print](#) [Share](#)

Priests and Warriors should regain its essential position

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

EreticaMente interviews Aleksandr Dugin, edited by Eduardo Zarelli

1.The “Dasein” concept (“occur”) of Martin Heidegger it's a significant anchoring point of your personal reflection about the significant and concrete anthropological existential condition related to the human existence, which is placed between Earth and World.

Do you consider possible to define your thought as a geophilosophy?

I consider Martin Heidegger as greatest philosopher. But there is explicit part in his writings and implicit. He has developed the philosophical basis for many different applications that he didn't make himself. So I found in Heidegger the principles of political philosophy that is given only as the some allusions, hints, remarks, but we can deduce it from the general context of his philosophy. It has almost nothing to do with his personal political engagement. It is something much deeper. So being up to the some degree follower of Third Political Theory he has laid the foundations for Fourth Political Theory and Metapolitics.

The same for geophilosophy. Explicitly he didn't develop it, but if we consider the full meaning of Da in the Da-Sein, we discover the fundamental dimension of so called geography, or else ambiance, milieu as something existential. I am calling it existential horizon.

Next point. Heidegger himself was convinced in the universal character of Dasein being ethnocentric as any thinking (or less thinking) person (and Westerners are not exception) – just because our thinking is tied to language, culture, history in the sense of Seynsgeschichte. Heidegger speaking of Dasein as something “universal” means West- European Dasein – Greek and German above all, that correspond in his view to the Beginning and the Ending of philosophical Thought.

But if accept existential character of place (Da) and its ontological links to culture and language we see that each Da (situation, placement, geographical and cultural location) presents different relation to Being (Sein), because of language and culture. So we receive dealing with different Daseins different set of “die Existentialen”. The relation to Death (being-to Death) and the care (Sorge) are variable in different places understood as existential horizons. From there begins the theories of multitude of Daseins that is the core of multipolar philosophy and geosophy that is its ontological (I would say fundamental-ontological) ground.

I have spoken once with direct disciple of Heidegger prof. von Herrmann. He said that Heidegger would disagree with such interpretation of Dasein. But nevertheless in my vision of his philosophy and in my interpretation of phenomenology as such (that was also Eurocentric – Husserl spoke about “European humanity” – very expressive!) we could enlarge the understanding of Dasein recognizing the anthropological difference of culture not only (as rightfully suggests modern Brazilian anthropologist Viveiros de Castro) as different interpretations of the same reality (multiculturalism) but as different interpretations of different realities (multinaturalism). Being-in-the-World as existential characteristic of Dasein constitutes different Worlds if we have the multitude of Daseins.

So starting with Heidegger and being absolutely indebted for his thought I apply his ideas to the realms he neither avoided or neglected or explicitly denied. May be my reading of Heidegger is a bit unorthodox but with such great great great thinker the orthodoxy is something doubtful, meaningless and at the end of the day impossible.

2. The civilization process does involve an increasing and dramatic separation between nature and culture. What's your interpretation of the technical issue facing the ecological sustainability?

The technic is metaphysics itself. There is nothing technical in technic. It begins with radical line of separation between two realms of being – culture and nature and it ends with killing both – no nature and no culture any more (as now). The only acceptable technic is the philosophical technic – Logos but only when it is fully conscious of its existential roots – fundamental-ontological Logos. I don't believe in nature without culture and in culture without nature. Culture is natural and nature is cultural. Subject and object are two sides of the same Being-in-the-World and the technic is the artificial and suicidal split of this existential unity.

Ecology is the dead end because it rests inside of the vicious dualism culture/nature. So I think we should revise the main philosophical attitude ecologists are wrong as well as technocrats are.

3. Disproportion is the distinctive sign of the accumulation and dissipation process related to the consumerist society and to the westernization of the world as a whole. What's your reflection about the “measure” and the sense of “limit”?

It is the core problem. Greeks called it *ὑβρις* is the essential feature of titanism. The Heaven is measure – of space, of time of being. When we loose the Heaven we loose the measure. Ernst Junger has rightfully described the world of Modernity as the reign of Titan – of «dismisura», of *ὑβρις*. The technic is already *ὑβρις* it tries to accumulate and thus to break the balance. Marcel Mauss in his *The Economy of gift* has shown importance of potlatch – of the annihilation of the plus-product in the process of sacred orgy. The titanism is the abdication and oblivion of such sacrificial practice. And that is the origins of capitalism and the Modernity. If we want more and more is the *dismisura*, it is as well abuse and we will pay for that with accumulation of the less and less something in the shadow. And once it will become apparent as catastrophe, wars and annihilation of the accumulated good (plus product). Capitalism is titanic and dismeasured. It is the revolt of the Earth against the Heaven. But once the Heaven strikes back. The gods reestablish the measure killings Titans and Gigants. That is Conservative Revolution the return of the Measure and the punishment of revolted chthonic powers.

4. Do you consider that the distinction between universal and universalistic could be able to get the difference between cultural pluralism and western assimilation?

The real universality is apophatic as the One of the Plato's Parmenides and neoplatonist. So we could approach universality only as in tangent. The real universality is not the destruction of the particular, ethnic, national, religiously or culturally limited, but the full realization of the essence of it. The ethnic man is the way to the universal man, the realization of the authentic existence of the concrete Dasein leads to the possible but never taken for granted universal Dasein. So the modern universalism is absolutely wrong. To divide peoples into atomic individuals is not the way to the universal. It is one step away from it. Trying to arrive to the figure without any kind of collective (ethnic, cultural, religious and so on) identity we arrive not to the universal man but to the machine, we destroy all what is human in us. So liberal universalism is more particularistic than the natural particularism of different peoples and cultures. With people there is symbolic universality that should be interpreted, discovered. The people is the way to the Man. The individual is something that is equal to himself. In the final case it is absolutely meaningless deprived of language and culture and turned in to the machine.

So assimilationism is good where there is something into what we propose to assimilate when there is collective identity. Modern occidental assimilationism is the invitation to the absolute loneliness, integration into the "lonely mob".

5. Does your assumption of the "fourth political theory" begin with the occurred dissolution of the big modern ideological narrations, including liberalism that, apparently, would look like an undisputed "unique thought" of the contemporaneity age?

In which sense must we get the practical all-pervading nature of individualistic utilitarianism related to the "capital form"?

I think that the most interesting point is the destiny of the concept of individual that is the basis of liberalism, its flag, its subject. It can be called "monad". The individual monad is the common denominator of modern capitalism – the reign of autonomous monads. But the problem is that monads conserve their "monadity" only being supported by the belonging to the apophatic One. So the monad is monad only when it is the henad in the same time. That means it should be open from above. When we close monad (as it is the case in liberal capitalism) we don't make it independent from the multitude from below and from henad (apophatic unity – real universality) from above. It is liberal illusion. Affirming monad against integrating Unity we by the same gesture destroy monadness of monad opening the way to the inner multiplicity. So the individual becomes dividual precisely in the moment it is affirmed as individual and nothing else. Nothing means here apophatic One (henad).

So we are living in the world where the monads dissolve themselves. It is the "natural" milieu for our existence. We are living in the dissolution, in liquid society and that is liquidity of capital, new nomadism and diffraction of the personality in the networks of all kind. There is no more subject. The individual (in fact dividual) becomes more and more objective, fragmented and dissipated. So it is not old good utilitarianism because there is no more human individual. We are becoming more and more post-human. Before we will be replaced by Artificial Intelligence we should be turned into robots. In that case we will not remark the last transformation.

The unique thought is not any more human. It is a kind of computer program destined not for users but for its algorithms. We are no more user it is illusion. We are used and abused by the System. And liberalism becomes each day more and more totalitarian. I am calling it Third Totalitarianism.

6. Albert Einstein affirmed : «We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them ». ON that way it cannot be an ideology but a dynamic way of thinking and mutual confrontation in order to face an epocal transiction. What kind of qualities must have a proper "formamentis" for its confrontation between principles and ruling relativism? Shall we refer to a mutation of "paradigma"?

Exactly. The type of thinking that prevents the solution of the challenges of Modernity and Post-Modernity – more that that correct formulation of these challenges – are three political theories. Nothing can be correctly solved and formulated when we stay on the position of liberalism , marxism or nationalism. The problem is not in the Modernity the problem is the Modernity itself. The Post-Modernity claimed to overcome it but failed drastically. Because of the conservation of the same liberationist, immanentist, titanic and progressist pathos of Modernity, the spirit of Enlightenment. The Post-Modernity wanted only to improve Modernity, make it more Modern. We need some real alternative to the Modernity, and the radical change of paradigm is really needed. First we need to

accept or imagine at least something absolutely outside of Modernity. Modernity is absolutely wrong. All its absolutes, values, ideals, truths, conventional wisdoms and so on should be put aside. We shouldn't fight against them we should simply make a distance – more distance than Post-Modernity is capable of. I think that traditionalism of Guenon and Evola are the excellent examples of what it is all about. They are more post-modern than any ultra-radical philosopher such as Deleuze. Deleuze is fully programmed by the spirit of Modernity, he is algorithm. So the shift of paradigm should be very radical – more radical than the radicals can imagine.

7. To Overpass modernity means to criticize the open society without an authoritarian regression. Which kind of social features could have a communitarism if based upon participatory will and voluntarism , eventually combining freedom and political duties?

To overcome the Modernity is not easy. Any alternative will be impregnated by the some modern prejudices. We need be afraid of nothing – including regress, authoritarianism and so on. We are ashamed of all such phenomena because we are still Modern. I like communitarianism. It has in itself something premodern as organic community of people living in the personalized relations to the nature and each other. But we shouldn't exclude the imagination of Empires, hierarchies and most of all sacredness, We need to restore all three traditional types – Priest, Warrior and Peasant. The economy is the field of peasant. So the peasant community and small manufacturers are the base of the material aspect of society. But outside of Modernity the materiality is the last concern. So the real basis of the society should be the Heaven – spiritual life, sacred values. The Earth should be once more conquered by the Heaven. So the Priests and Warriors should regain its essential position. So we need reverse the Modernity that began with quite opposite with the putting the material over spiritual, the Earth over the Heaven.

8. If we consider Ortega y Gasset, looking at his work named "The rebellion of the masses" , he gets the pivotal point of the XX century era: an era devoid of social types who could be able to address the destiny of the historical events.

At the same time Christopher Lasch, with his "The Elite's rebellion", has depicted how the ruling postmodern classes will be reflecting the main features of the indistinct mass. Which kind or role does the "political" have inside your philosophical theory?

The Political is the part of the Philosophical. They can not be separated. Any philosophical thought has political dimension. Any political action is rooted in the realm of philosophy. But the Political is expression not the core of the Philosophical. So we need to see its ontological unity with implicit

hierarchy. Any political is but instrument in the hand of philosopher. But the political is in the front line and the philosopher is in the shadow.

9. Do you recognize a multilateral geopolitica vision of the international relationships? What's the possible continental connection between Russia and Europe?

I have written about that many books and can not repeat that in few words. The multipolarity is the consequence of my understanding of the plurality of Daseins.

Russia should become independent pole of multipolar world. The Europa should become other pole. We have two different Daseins. We need to respect such difference. May be there is the Third Europe (Eastern Europe) because of very particular features of East-European Logos. Currently I am working over 19 and 20 volumes of my main work Noomahia dedicated specially to the Eastern Europe. But in general I consider Europe and Russia-Eurasia as two separate civilizations with many common features and many differences. The dialogue between them can be very useful for both of us... But it should be dialogue between European Europe and Russian Russia.

10. Contemporaney Physic and Philosophy have revalued the Caos idea, this referred not to a whatever unformed Order but to more complex systems like the multiple results equations.

These, on reality, do refer to a complex order itself, thus (far) difficult to get by natural experience, even if really existent.

Do you feed a pessimistic vision about the decadence of the civilization or do you consider history a still open and not determined route?

The concept of chaos is very profound and demand the whole lecture. I am studying in Ancient culture and in contemporaneous interpretation. Chaos is the world in the state that precedes the Order. That is essential. Such chaos is the possibility of new creation. The moderns understand by chaos the confusion that follows the destruction of the order. It is the case of actual chaos. It is not chaotic in the Greek sense, that is the dead chaos, that has no life inside of it.

I am pessimistic as to status qua. If the things go the same way they are going now it will bring total destruction of the humanity. May be we deserve that. More we acquire more we are doomed.

But before being totally replaced by Artificial Intelligence what globalists and progressists want to do, we can decide otherwise. The only thing that differentiates us from machines (but we are already machines in some way accepting the System as it is) the possibility of decision. The only decision that is

real Decision is to exist or not to exist authentically. What we choose the Self of Dasein or das Man of Artificial Intelligence. Now we have the last chance to choose differently. So I believe in the open history. But that chance we will have it before we lose the possibility to die because the essence of Dasein is the being-in-front-of-Death. The immortality project (post-humanism) and Artificial Intelligence are two ways to deprive us of our Dasein. We have nothing to lose except of Dasein. Everything else is already lost.

(taken from www.ereticamente.net with the translation of Stefano Codari)

4pt

Prince Nikolai Trubetzkoy and his Theory of Eurasianism

December 6, 2016

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Dugin's Guideline –

On April 16th, 1890, Nikolai Sergeevich Trubetzkoy, the great Russian thinker, linguist, and founder of the ideological movement of Eurasianism, was born. Trubetzkoy's main idea was that Russia is not simply a European country, as the Russian Westernizers insisted, but a particular, separate civilization, the Russian World. This is the most important point.

We are no less different from Europe than Iranians or Indians. Sure, we share common roots with Greco-Roman civilization, but this civilization underwent a schism that began in the 6th century when the Western Empire fell away from Byzantium and then disappeared under attack by Germanic tribes. Already back then, two identities formed: a Catholic identity in the West, and an Orthodox identity in the East. The two gradually drifted away from one another further and further until, in 1054, the Orthodox and Catholic worlds parted ways once and for all. We, Russians, adopted Christianity from Byzantium and have kept none other than this Eastern Christian tradition to this day.

After the fall of Constantinople to the Turks, we took over the Byzantine mission. This is not merely the mission of a country, Trubetzkoy asserted, but the pole of self-conscious and independent Orthodox civilization, its center. But the Slavophiles also recognized this. The innovation of Trubetzkoy and the other Eurasianists after him lies in that they added to this Byzantine religious and cultural heritage the Turko-Mongol component and drew attention to the fact that Russia's expansion to the East precisely replicated the contours of Genghis Khan's empire. We once again built this empire, only not from East to West as the Mongols did, but from West to East. This only strengthened Russia's self-identity. Russians differed from the West religiously thanks to Byzantium, and geopolitically thanks to the Mongols and Turks, from whom we took the baton of ruling over the enormous space of Eurasia, this time Russian and Orthodox.

Trubetzkoy proposed this Eurasian idea for Russia, as an Orthodox and continental civilization, to lie at the heart of a new world view that was supposed to replace communism.

Trubetzkoy literally prophesied that communism would collapse insofar as it had no spiritual, religious dimension, no Christ at its head. But in order not to slide into the abyss of the West, which is an alien civilization to us, the Communist Party was to be replaced with the Eurasian Order.

According to Trubetzkoy and other Eurasianists, this Order was supposed to continue the course toward social justice and opposition to the West, but complete this ideology with an Orthodox, Byzantine dimension and put faith in Christ at the head. Trubetzkoy gave this a special term: ideocracy, or rule by idea.

Eurasianism was neither nationalism nor a mere restoration of the monarchy. Trubetzkoy called for appealing to the deepest essence of the Russian people and other fraternal peoples building the Great Empire together with it. The Eurasian elite was to become a new aristocracy serving God and the people. The Eurasianists named the West the main enemy, a complete antipode to our own civilization, or the main enemy of humanity as Trubetzkoy called it in his first programmatic book, *Europe and Mankind*. The message of his book boiled down to the need for humanity to save Europe, which was already rotting away by the beginning of the 20th century. And only the Russians had the strength to do this.

Only half of the prophecies of this great Eurasianist came true. The USSR collapsed as the wonderful idea of social justice was established without God and even against God. Instead of a Christian socialism, an anti-Christian socialism was built. And it collapsed. A Eurasian Order failed to be established and take over power from the communists. Instead, the worst enemies of Russia came to power – the liberals, a human enemy far worse than communists.

Now much is becoming clear. It is obvious that Trubetzkoy was right. We have proclaimed the construction of a Eurasian Union and we all the more clearly understand the true nature of the West. The second half of Trubetzkoy's prophecy, the construction of a Eurasian Order, is, from the point of view of the Eurasianists, the meaning of the historical moment in which now we find ourselves.

Principles and strategy of coming war

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

To tell the truth, war has broken out. War has been "broken out". That war, which is most important now, is the confrontation of two civilizations: the Land civilization, represented by Russia, and the Sea civilization, represented by the US. It is a standoff between a trade-based system, and a heroic civilization, between Carthage and Rome, Athens and Sparta. However, at certain moments it reaches a "hot" stage. We are in this moment again. We are at the brink of the war, and also one exists. However, this war can become a major and, perhaps, the sole battle of our lives, at any time. As the major players – the US and Russia – are nuclear powers, the war involves all the nations of the Earth. It has every chance to become the end of humankind. Of course this is not guaranteed, but such a plot twist cannot be excluded.

The spiritual plan of the great conflict is comprehend in special terms and contexts. There, the balance of power is always in favor of the Light, despite the faithful's position. However, at the strategic level, it may seem a little different. The roles in the war are not symmetrical. Russia is in a weaker position, but trying to get back its status of the global player. It only seeks to restore its potential regional power to exert its influence freely in areas near to its borders. However, it is unacceptable for the United States, which, despite everything, remain the global hegemony and refuse to lose the monopolarity by its own will.

If we take into account the spiritual background of the war, it will become clear that the darkness doesn't allow the light to exist in any proportion, it will calm down only when will be able to fight the light everywhere, not only globally, but also locally, one beam is enough to turn the darkness into the darkness, without the light, it can pretend to be anything. There is an important conclusion: the global ambitions of the modern materialistic technocratic West, the globalism itself are not a contingency, but the essence of the force that we deal with. It is naive to assume that you can negotiate with the devil, or deceive him. You can only win. This is the law of spiritual warfare. Today, it attacks, and the other defends. Therefore, the war is almost on Russian territory, in the area of its direct national interests. At the same time, Russia tries to go beyond its borders; the war is defensive for it. Currently, it has only regional objectives. However, the global nuclear power prevents it from reach them. This complicates the situation and elevates the conflict to a global level. In any case, Russia is attacked, and it defends. This is important.

Let's now turn to the fronts of the war.

First Front: Syria

From the very beginning of the Syrian conflict, Moscow supported Bashar Assad who was played against by Washington, Western Europe and the Middle East's US proxies: Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey. Each of the countries, however, followed their own interests. The tool to overthrow Assad was radical Islamic groups: ISIS, Al-Qaeda (the al-Nusra Front), etc. However, Russia became fully involved in military operations only in 2015, when an exhausted Assad asked for open military support. In this case, Moscow received allies, represented by the Shiite axis: Tehran – Shiite Iraq – and the Lebanese Hezbollah; they not only cooperate, but even fight side by side. The Shiite world is strictly anti-American, but at the same time, at the regional level, is opposed to radical Sunni Saudi and Qatari financial backing of the Salafist extremist groups.

On the first front, Russia faces the United States and NATO countries, not directly but indirectly. The Western countries themselves are at war with ISIS, as they say, but in fact strongly support the radical Islamic groups to overthrow Assad. The same tactics were used to overthrow Gaddafi in Libya.

In addition, the presence of Salafi jihadists in Iraq, as well as the Taliban in Afghanistan, seems to justify the ongoing presence of American troops. Therefore, the first fronts are a vital challenge for Russia: it fights indirectly with the US and NATO, and almost openly, with Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Qatar. Therefore, the war in Syria can't be considered as an ordinary anti-terrorist operation: in addition, the Salafists now controls most parts of Syria, having an impressive amount of direct and indirect support. But Russia is the nuclear power. Therefore, its involvement in the Syrian war dramatically changed the situation, bringing it from the local to the global level. With its involvement, it has put a lot at stake. Now it is not only Assad's problem, his enemies are forced to fight with Russia. Nevertheless, the opposite is true too: Russia challenges not only the extremist network of ISIS and al-Nusra, but American hegemony and Middle East Salafism, with its serious base in the wealthiest petrodollar monarchies in the Gulf region. This is important: how does Moscow understand the seriousness of the situation of the first front, and how far is it ready to go in a very difficult war scenario, with an impressive coalition on the opposite side. After all, the US and NATO are there, no matter what they say.

Second Front. Turkey

Involving itself more and more in the Syrian war, Russia faces, as it is evident, Turkey - which is essentially occupying the north of Syria, inhabited by Turcoman tribes, and has begun a military conflict with Syrian Kurds. Erdogan has established an alliance with wealthy Qatar for a long time, funding the Salafi groups (such as the "Muslim Brotherhood" in Egypt) and has begun an active struggle against Assad. Therefore, when the Russian military in Syria started bombing the positions of the Salafists in the north of Syria, it was involved in a direct conflict with Ankara. The military jet downing and the brutal murder of the Russian pilots were just a pretext to escalate the tension. When Russia started performing decisively and getting involved in the conflict, there was no other way, the war with Turkey became a very real event.

Then there was the breaking off of trade relations, the tourism ban, and the expulsion of Turkish construction companies, which in the economic sphere is the strongest and most painful hit for Turkey, which has led to multibillion-dollar losses. Ankara is constantly threatening to close the Bosphorus to Russian sea crafts, which would be cutting the vital artery for Russian troops in Latakia.

The Turks sent, in recent weeks, a significant part of its troops from the border with Greece to the border with Syria, and this can be regarded as preparation for a military invasion. All these facts greatly increase the risk of a new Russian-Turkish war. How likely is it? It is more likely than it has ever been in the 20th century and the first decades of the 21st. The Second Front has already been opened. When an outright conflict will break out, no one can say for sure. Theoretically, it could happen at any time. Here again, it is worth remembering that Turkey is a NATO member-state, and that it coordinates its actions in Syria with Washington. It means that Russia will face-off against the Western coalition (with the USA in charge) performing on the Turkish side in a potential new war, as it was with the Crimean War. So again, a regional conflict would obviously have a global impact. This is especially true because in Turkey there is a US nuclear military base. It would be difficult for an outright war with Turkey not to be the start of WWIII.

Third Front. Ukraine

The reunification of Crimea with Russia is not recognized by anyone in the world. The DPR (Donetsk People's Republic) and the LPR (the Luhansk People's Republic) are a bleeding wound with an unknown status. Poroshenko's position in Kiev is quite unstable, and a real change in the economic and social situation in Ukraine in general, even theoretically, is impossible. Therefore, at a certain moment, Kiev has only one way: a new round of tension and escalation in the East, and even an invasion of Crimea.

If Ukraine were face-to-face against Russia in this situation, it would be suicidal for Kiev.

However, we should take into account the US and NATO. The West was behind the coup d'état of the winter of 2014. Moreover, at some point, an attack on the consolidated position of the Novorossiia militants and even on Crimea, by the Ukrainian army, is quite possible even for Ukrainian domestic reasons, even more so in the context of the logic of the global confrontation between Russia and the United States.

It is worth noting that all three fronts are situated close to Russian borders, in the area that separates Eurasia and Russia, the continental space of the Heartland, from its western territories. It is the area where civilizations of the East and West meet. Usually, disputes over these territories start world wars and global conflicts. All three fronts are on former Ottoman Empire territories, as Russia gained Novorossiia and the Crimea from the Turks, and Syria was a part of the Empire too. Earlier these were areas of the Orthodox-Byzantine world. Therefore, the three fronts have an enormous historical and civilizational sense.

Now let's look at the domestic problems of Russia. There are three fronts too.

Fourth Front. Salafi terrorism in Russia

The network structures of radical Islam, tied to Saudi Arabia, Qatar and Turkey have long been deployed in Russia: both in the North Caucasus as well as in the other regions. As the influx of Muslim population in Russian cities and the capital continues, the networks spread all over and entangle the entire space of Russia. They are not limited to areas densely populated by Muslims, but actively expand their zone of influence in other social environments. Using a variety of domestic problems, radical Sunni Islam has become quite popular as an alternative to incoherent and lethargic official ideological agenda of Moscow and its purely conformist representatives in the regions. It breeds the preparation and training of terrorist groups and ISIS' direct branches.

If the special services become technically less involved with the task of group deterrence, the strategic plan and the more ideological program to combat the phenomena will not exist, which will over time make the ForthFront extremely important. The Forth Front was actually a hot spot in the First and

Second Chechen War campaign; the breakthrough in the Second one was achieved only by using a hard-patriotic line in domestic policy.

Any new attempts at weakening the national discourse automatically strengthen the centrifugal trends and the extremist groups. The Forth Front is open and is in operation, but the scale of the problems it causes, we don't actually know. Without sowing panic among the population, the security services hide from ordinary people the quantity of averted terrorist attacks and other preventive measures, which, in fact, is impressive even today. Because the United States and its foreign centers, the US proxies in the Middle East, support the Forth Front, we can expect serious financial support and, most importantly, the support of anew escalation.

Fifth Front. Fifth Column

This Front is a network of opposition forces whose core consists of the pro-American liberals who dream to return to the 1990s, the period of obvious looting of Russia and the selling of all its assets to foreign customers, as well as the omnipotence of the liberal elites that have, as its cannon fodder, the radical nationalists and Russian neo-Nazis who are dissatisfied with the Russian authorities and its passive policy on the growing migration and inarticulate or complete absence of the national idea.

The only liberals are not enough to organize weighty and large-scale protests, so the radical Russian nationalists play a role of massive support in the coalition. However, the pro-American liberals are the main center to coordinate efforts and make major decisions, and are responsible for contact with Washington.

The US itself officially supports the "democratic" movement, giving it substantial sums from their budget. However, the funding from other, less evident, sources of the Russian Fifth Column are much greater than the open data shows. On Bolotnaya Square, in the spring of 2012, the Fifth Column showed what it could do. In the case of aggravation of the consequences of the sanctions and possible military conflicts, the Fifth Front can become a significant factor in Russia's weakening. It is preparing a stab in the back that may be decisive if the administrative system's inefficiency (and nothing shows that it will be more effective in the near future) continues. Under certain circumstances, sections of their rotated and disappointed ordinary people can join the Fifth Front, creating a serious threat.

Sixth Front. Pro-Western liberals and governmental agents of influence

This group was recently called the Sixth Column. It is the liberals and the pro-Westerners who integrated into power in the 2000s or remained there since the 1990s, accepting the games' new rules. In contrast to the Fifth Column, the Sixth Column's representatives are formally loyal to the authorities, and unquestioningly obey it and act in a spirit of complete conformity. However, the Sixth Column follows western ideology, seeing the United States and NATO as the vanguard of progressive human kind, with the economy being guided solely using liberal methods and approaches. Often, the fortunes and families of the higher Russian officials are in the Western countries. In this situation, loyalty and constrained patriotism hides the consistent sabotage of orientation on national sovereignty, State ideology deterrence and implementation of economic, administrative and information strategies, leading, eventually, to the demoralization of society, a weakening economy and further population deideologization. The Sixth Front consists of systematic, deliberate and very skillful sabotage of the Russian revival, the containment and genuine substitution of the patriotic reform, creating efficient simulacra and counterfeits. The Sixth Column is no different in its ideology from the Fifth one, as it is also oriented to the West, but it hides it, preferring to strike at the regime from within, not from the outside. Moreover, just like the Fifth Column, the Sixth Column is controlled from an external center, from Washington, although it is more subtle and nuanced than the Fifth Column. The US Council on Foreign Relations (CFR) manages the Sixth Front's coordination so that the structure is almost officially represented at the highest levels of the Russian government. In general, this type consists of a large part of the "liberal government" as well as a significant segment of other government institutions.

Now let's put ourselves in the shoes of American strategists. The escalation in US-NATO relations with Russia is obvious. Moscow behaved as a sovereign regional power in the cases of South Ossetia and Abkhazia in 2008, Crimea and Novorossiia in 2014 and finally Syria in 2015, and if it is necessary, it will use the power to insist on its national interests in certain areas. It is incompatible with the continuation of American hegemony that is still global. Moscow would have to build its policy in accordance with Washington and NATO, and of course, these actions will not appease the forces of sanctions. Therefore, despite the superficial courtesy and the liberal rhetoric, Russia is out of the West's control. It is a fact. And Washington must somehow respond to it. If he admits it, it would be equal to the denial of hegemony. But in the event of decline, the American Empire will not necessarily stop at the borders that it still firmly controls today. Encouraged by the success of the Russians, one may want to look at the strength of the Americans. Therefore, in Washington strategists' position, it would be logical to activate all six Fronts. Especially because, in all six cases, America will not outperform itself: even the worst outcome would not cause its fatal collapse, as it is protected by a vast European, North African zone, followed by the Atlantic and the Pacific Ocean in the west (especially since there is not any Russian activities in its east side). Moreover, it will be quite reasonable to synchronize the blows to Russia from all sides: militants in Syria, supporting Turkey, making Kiev start a new wave of fighting (and even to attack Crimea), leading the Russian domestic radical Salafi terrorist structures, backing the Fifth Column (finding the appropriate social occasion) and putting another ultimatum sanctions to encourage the Sixth Columns to conduct sabotage more actively and efficiently.

At the same time, it would be equally logical on the one hand to maintain and perhaps to even strengthen the sanctions, to reduce the oil prices by a few points, and, at the same time, to start attacking the Russian leadership with conciliatory trolling like "the West will help you", "the terrorists is a common problem" (common because some are fighting with it, and the others support it) and "the main problem is China" (let the Russians deny their nuclear weapons, and we will protect them, putting our nuclear missiles on their territories) etc.

However, the simple analytical estimation hides something very serious. War. A real one with bloody seas, fires, torture, suffering and pain. The war in which we will be involved. And, since the three fronts are outside Russia, it is likely that the war on the foreign territories will be accompanied with civil war. That, however, we know very well from history.

Winning strategy: internal enemy

Let us imagine that we, quite objectively, estimated the risks, and our analysis is correct. What should Russia do in such a situation? In levying the war or at least being close to it, we must not only react situationally, but also have a plan for how to wage the war and to win it. It is quite logical to have the desire to win, isn't it? Now it is important to find way how to achieve it, even if it's just in theory.

It is obvious that you can only wage war effectively with an external enemy if the society is quite consolidated and mobilized internally. It is desirable to be mentally prepared for the war. To do this, people must understand who is the enemy and who is not, and, most importantly, why this is the case and not so otherwise. You mustn't demonize the enemy at the very beginning of the war. The image of the enemy must be formed in advance and deliberately.

Therefore, the first task to gain victory would be real fully-fledged company to create the entirely negative, monstrous, satanic image of the United States and the West in general. Therefore, the West is a place where the devil resides. It is the center of the global capitalist tentacles. It is the matrix of rotting cultural perversion and a vice grip of falsehood and cynicism, violence and hypocrisy. Russia already does this, but since the Sixth Column is responsible for anti-Western propaganda, it is a caricature or something miserable and not very convincing. It is this sabotage that describes the essence of the Sixth Front. Its "soldiers" do not refuse to fulfill the government orders, even asking for more and more, but their execution has turned into a farce, stultifying and subtly discrediting all undertakings. Awkward and insincere propaganda often brings the opposite effect. Therefore, by creating the images of the American enemy and its satellites (which we actually have to fight), it would be logical to charge those

who think exactly that way and punish them with maximum clarity and cogency to the sleeping masses. Meanwhile, the agents of influence of the West are entrusted to criticize the West. With predictable results. Such an approach is incompatible with the "strategy for victory" and it should be reconsidered (if Russia wants to have at least a chance to win in the coming war).

From the first point we move logically to the next one. It is important to dismantle the Sixth Column structures as soon as possible, removing the liberals and the pro-Westerners from all the key positions. Together with it, liberalism in the economy will be abolished, which will allow:

The establishment of national control over the Central Bank.

The pivot away from the dollar in foreign trade to any different reserve currency (such as the Yuan).

The achievement of full financial sovereignty.

The conductivity of the economy's mobilization in the wartime.

In parallel, it is necessary to form the National Committee for the Mass Media that will reconstruct information work in accordance with the emergency requirements.

The efficiency of the purely destructive Fifth Column's activity is largely tied with the efficiency of the Sixth Column's sabotage. The Fifth and Sixth Fronts are inextricably connected. Therefore, the destruction of the Sixth Column's power will dramatically weaken the Fifth Column which leaders, in emergency situations, could be either interned (by the way, the measures of house arrest are already administered to some of them), or expelled. Of course, any legal means of the liberal dissemination or the destructive nationalist propaganda should be banned.

The Forth Front is a problem, as the State does not have any ethnic and national policies. At the moment, there is only the same Sixth Column or the cognitively inappropriate bureaucrats. That is why the real challenges of uncontrolled migration and ethnic and religious tensions are approved by the bureaucracy with meaningless, for the Russian reality, empty slogans of the "civil society" and "tolerance". Without a coherent system of ethnic and national strategy against Islamic extremism and terrorism, issues in Russia will not be solved. Some security measures are not enough; it needs to eliminate or permanently change the social environment. Forced operations against terrorist fundamentalism must be correlated with the scale, including the ideological, model of ethnic and national policy.

The winning strategy: external enemy

Ukraine – the Third Front – should be ready for armed provocations from Kiev and to repel them. Sooner or later, Russia will have to radically solve the Novorossiyan issue as relying on the fact that Kiev will fall by himself or will abandon its pro-American and anti-Russian policy is somewhat irresponsible. To effectively protect Crimea and resolve the Donbass issue, all the Novorossiya space must be freed, and, if the war is inevitable, Moscow will have only one task - to win as soon as possible and as efficiently as possible. Creating a friendly Russian zone from Odessa to Kharkov, either creating independent States or including them in the part of the Russian Lands, is the goal that could be considered as a victory. The fate of Central and Western Ukraine has no great value.

Regarding the Turkish Second Front, there, in addition to the military operational development which is the military leadership's task and cannot be discussed by analysts, Russia should pay attention to two main factors: the political opposition to the regime of Erdogan that, in the current circumstances, has become a natural ally, and the fundamental problem for Turkey, the Kurds. Both factors are crucial to the success in the Russian-Turkish conflict. It is extremely important to conduct anti-Turkish propaganda in Russian society, constantly stressing that the US and its supporters (Erdogan) are responsible for the escalation of the region's conflict, and that Moscow doesn't consider the Turks as its historical enemy to Moscow. Therefore, any parallels with the Russian-Turkish war, even in internal cases, will only unite the Turkish with Erdogan and strengthen the enemy. In contrast, the support of the Turkish politicians who do not share Erdogan's views of Neo-Ottomanism could be decisive. At the same time, of course, Russia should intensify cooperation with the Kurds, as it is an imposing force in Turkey.

Finally, the First Front, Syria. We did not accidentally put it in the end of the "winning strategy". The most acute confrontational form is always the most practical and full of technical and military detail. However, it always depends on the particulars of society, and local successes – on the outside, often global, environment.

We have seen that Russia has an important regional ally, the Shi'ite world, which is represented primarily by Iran and the Lebanese Hezbollah. These are Russian "brothers in arms", and it should do its best to deepen the alliance. Obviously, it's not only the Russians that understand its value, but even the pro-American forces in Russia and in Iran, so they will try to do everything possible to bring division amongst the allies. It should be nipped in the bud, at least in Russia, and concisely spelled out at the negotiations with the Shi'ites.

Next, Russians need the political, preferably military and economic support, of the countries of the planned multi-polar club, BRICS. China plays a special role there, preferring not to come to the forefront

of the US opposition, but being ready to support Moscow, staying on the sidelines. Many things in Syria now depends on Moscow-Beijing relations, and it needs maximum attention.

Russia has no chance of making European countries its fully-fledged allies in Syria, as the US influence on them is too great. However, any distancing from Washington by the European powers (especially France, Germany and Italy) alongside differences in NATO will be very useful to Moscow. If Europe is to continue to grow its wave of right-conservative parties and movements, who are generally loyal to Russia, it will significantly strengthen its position in Syria. The Russian propaganda in Europe during wartime has particular importance.

As in Syria, Russia faces forces openly supported by Saudi Arabia and Qatar. As Qatar is involved in the plane crash with Russian tourists over the Sinai, Russia should pay special attention to the maximum destabilization of the regimes. Under certain circumstances, a direct attack on Qatar and military support for the Houthis in Yemen, as well as the Shiites in Bahrain, cannot be excluded. The invitation of the Russian troops in Iraq and Lebanon by their governments is strategically crucial; it will help to wage a full-scale war against the main bases of the ISIS terrorists and break their infrastructure connection with Turkey and the Gulf countries.

In general, Russia is already at war in the Middle East, so it should be recognized as an accomplished fact that, using the whole arsenal of available means, first of all, intelligence networks aimed at promoting, using different ways, Russian interests in the region such as information, economic, ideological, etc, must urgently be revived.

The last argument in this war will involve Russian nuclear weapons, which, thank God, the 90's liberal reformers did not manage to destroy. It is common sense not to use them ever. However, it does mean that they cannot impose severe restrictions on Russia's main enemy, the United States of America. Fearing complete destruction, the United States will have to play against Russia abiding by certain rules.

Seventh Front. Americans against Federal Government

In addition, in terms of the United States, it is important to open the Seventh Front. In fact, the US have many people who are unsatisfied with the ruling elite that profess the globalist ideology, drawing the USA into bloody wars, destroying the traditional European Christian identity. New America, where nothing is left from the US itself, and which serves the interests of the global financial oligarchy that has no culture or identity, destroys old America. Therefore, the support of US traditionalism and the

conservatism of American identity is an important task for Russia. Its ally in the USA is the American people. In addition, many contradictions have accumulated in the social sphere, in inter-ethnic relations.

The majority of American society does not accept the moral degeneration. The federal government uses each convenient occasion to begin the abolishment of the second amendment of the Constitution allowing the Americans to keep and bear arms. The growing proportions of the Latin population, mostly Catholic, bring to the American public a new identity that is not hostile to Russia. Russia should be actively involved in the struggle for influence on the American society, strengthening the explanation of the Russian spiritual position in the war, showing that Russians and Americans have a common enemy: a manic satanic elite that have usurped power and are leading the whole humanity, including the Americans, towards the inevitable catastrophe. The elite's results are evident: the whole Middle East is already covered in blood, they are not able any more to establish any order, the globalist elite (the CFR, the neocons, the representatives of the international financial oligarchy of Wall Street) implants everywhere only chaos, devastation, death and pain. The destruction of such a cancer on humanity is a matter for the entire world, including the Americans, who are not only its instruments but also victims.

Where is the city?

It is far from easy to win in this game. As the name of this game is the Big War. Nevertheless, when the Great War comes, it can only be avoided by slavery and deliberate recognition as a loser. Russian history has had no such moments. As much as it may seem difficult, somehow Russians coped with it.

We are not talking just about the geopolitical confrontation, but about the redistribution of influential spheres or the fulfillment of national interests. It is about something much deeper and more important.

All religions have a section dealing with the end of time and the final battle. The Christians, as well as the Jews and the Muslims, associate the events of the cycle with the Big War. Moreover, invariably all three religions describe the Middle East as the place of the Great War, as the field of Armageddon and the neighboring territories. For the Muslims, Damascus, the Umayyad Mosque, is considered to be the place where the Second Coming of Christ is to be held. Therefore, the war in Syria has frankly an eschatological sense. After all, Syria is a part of the Holy Land where the Savior treaded the ground. For the Jews, waiting for the imminent arrival of Moshiach, the escalation of violence on its borders, in areas critical to Israel's existence, has an eschatological significance. The American Protestants, dispensationalists, see the Last Battle as the invasion of the north Gogh (understand as Russia) army to the Holy Land. Finally, the Athos monks and Greek saints, such as Cosmas Aeolian[1] or Saint Paisios of Mount Athos, repeatedly predicted the release of Russian troops and the collapse of Constantinople and Turkey. So, St. Arsenios of Cappadocia in Faras told the faithful that they will lose their homeland, but

soon will find it again: "Foreign troops will come, Christ they will believe in, language they will not know... They will ask: Where is the City?"[2] It is understood as the reference to the Russian army approaching Constantinople. In one of the conversations Saint Paisios said:

" – Know that Turkey will collapse. There will be war two and a half years. We shall be victorious because we — Orthodox.

– Gerontius, we tolerate damage in the war?

– Hey, at most, one or two of the island will take, but we will give, and Constantinople. You'll see, you'll see!" [3]

Recently, one or two years ago, all these predictions would have caused only a shrug of the shoulders, what a fairy tale! But... today: blood is being shed in the Middle East; there are military operations around Damascus; Russians are not merely present, but fight in the Holy Land; the conflict with Turkey has started and it can't be excluded that it will lead to the real war. From an eschatological perspective, it is time to return to the holy places, the Holy Land, Constantinople and Kiev. The statement that we are not living in the End Times now seems unscientific. As Elder Paisius said: "You'll see, you'll see!" So, we will see.

Thus, where is the city?

[1] Zoitakis A. Life and prophecies of Cosmas Aeolian, 2007

[2] Χριστόδουλος Αγιορείτης, ιερομοναχος. Σκέυος Εκλογής. Άγιον Όρος, 1996.

[3] Zoitakis A. Father Paisius told me..., 2003

Race, "Ethnos" and "The Fourth Political Theory"

By Giuliano Adriano Malvicini

Part 1 of 3

Alexander Dugin has designated liberalism as the enemy of the "fourth political theory", or rather, since the enemy can only be an actually existing group of people and not an idea or ideology, he has designated as the enemy all those are in favour of the global hegemony of liberalism (that is, the hegemony of "the West"). "If you are in favour of global liberal hegemony, you are the enemy" is one of his slogans.

What does Dugin mean by "liberalism"? Not the ideology of those whom Americans refer to as "liberals." It is important for Americans to realise that calling someone a "liberal" in Europe means something quite different from calling someone a "liberal" in the United States. "Liberals" in the United States are on the left: they vote for the Democratic party and are in favour a welfare state and a regulated economy. In Europe, they would be considered social democrats. Ideologically, they are egalitarians and tend to be critical of laissez-faire capitalism. They oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from an egalitarian point of view. They view prison sentences as therapeutic and socialising rather than as forms of punishment. They believe in "social justice" rather than justice through retribution. They believe that human beings are basically good and can be redeemed through "social work". They believe in social conditioning rather than personal responsibility. They believe that human beings can be redeemed in this world. They tend to be in favour of a strict separation of church and state, while at the same time advocating an egalitarian world-view that is essentially a form of secularised Christianity.

In Europe, "liberals" are on the right: they are generally opposed to the welfare state, in favour of free markets, the privatisation of the infrastructure and a largely unregulated economy. Traditionally, they also support various conservative social policies, placing an emphasis on individual responsibility as the correlative of the notion of individual rights. In other words, liberalism is a bourgeois ideology, favouring a capitalist economy, based on the enlightenment ideology of individual human rights. Today, however, the polarity between left and right is becoming much less sharp, and gradually being replaced by a general consensus. The social policies of European liberal parties often coincide with those associated with the post-1968, libertarian left. Liberal, pro-capitalist parties oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from the point of view of individualist libertarianism. They oppose categorisations of human beings in collective terms. Everyone should be treated as an individual, in an unprejudiced way. Ideas of national, religious or sexual identity are passé. National borders and ethnic communities, insofar as they limit the freedom of the individual, should be abolished. The freedom of the individual

must be defended as long as it does not interfere with the rights of other individuals. This is the liberalism that Dugin has designated as the enemy: globalist capitalism founded on the ideology of human rights.

Today, the common foundations and origins of the social democratic, egalitarian left and the bourgeois, liberal right in the enlightenment ideology of human rights has come more to the fore. Both left and right-wing mainstream parties today tend to favour multiculturalism, immigration, gay rights and the separation of church and state. They share fundamental views about gender equality and sometimes drug liberalisation. These policies are legitimised by the "right" from the point of view of individual rights, and by the "left" from the point of view of egalitarianism. Moreover, the middle-class leftist "revolutionaries" of the late 60s and early 70s have often made a transition from the communist left to the liberal right, realising that their adherence to the left was based on an ideological self-misunderstanding. They were essentially bourgeois libertarians who mistook themselves for communists.

The difference between the left and the right in Europe today is a difference of interpretation of a single fundamental anthropological and ideological legacy, that of the enlightenment. It would more correct to talk about "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" rather than simply "liberal hegemony". Both liberalism and egalitarianism are based on the ideology of human rights, but emphasise different aspects. Right-wing liberals emphasise the individual aspect of human rights. Leftist egalitarians emphasise the universal aspect of human rights. Both conceptions of humanity - universal man and individual man - are abstractions: defined only in negative terms, embodying an abstract freedom. Both universal man and individual man are defined as NOT belonging to a particular group or category (ethnic or otherwise). Insofar as man is universal, "he" cannot be defined or limited as belonging to any particular ethnic group, gender or other category. The individual, on the other hand, cannot as such be subsumed under any category or defined as belonging to any collectivity (nationality ethnicity, gender, etc) since this would violate his or her (its?) individuality. The individual, then, is any and every human being and potentially corresponds to all of humanity. The individual is universal (as a representative of "humanity" as such) and all human beings are, as such, individuals. In other words, "universal man" can only be "individual man". Egalitarianism and individualism ultimately boil down to the same thing.

It would more correct, then, to talk about a "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" than simply "liberal hegemony". This hegemony is both political and metapolitical. All established, mainstream political parties in Europe today gravitate towards this liberal-egalitarian centre. This leaves certain groups marginalised. Since the centre is the rational, humane, bourgeois individual, monopolising the legacy of the enlightenment, with reason itself as the defining trait of humanity, those who deviate in some way from the centre are in varying degrees viewed as less-than-human, non-rational and unenlightened. The marginalised are dismissed as irrational, "crazy" and "extremist". They are de-humanised, deprived of a

voice and the right to participate in the political sphere: deprived of political subjectivity. These groups include the various losers of liberal modernity, such as religious conservatives (mainly Christian and Muslim), who oppose gay rights and the separation of church and state. Christian religious conservatives are not completely marginalised, however - they still have a presence within established political parties, albeit one that is growing ever weaker. Another marginalised group are communists, who oppose the idea of individual rights, free enterprise and private property. They, too, however, are not completely marginalised, especially within the universities and cultural institutions. When the need arises, they are allowed to form parts of coalition governments. They also share a common basis with the established political parties in the egalitarian, universalist aspects of their ideology, which has its roots in the enlightenment. Much more marginalised and demonised are nationalists, who oppose, in varying degrees, universalism (to the extent that they oppose immigration), free trade (to the extent that they want to protect national economies) and individualism (to the extent that they view national and ethnic identity as in some cases having primacy over individual identity). Finally, the most marginalised and "untouchable" group of all are racialsists and racial nationalists, who oppose not only universalism, but also egalitarianism. However heterogenous these groups are, they are often reduced to the same by the liberal centre.

Alain de Benoist, Dugin and Alain Soral want to create an "alliance of the periphery against the centre", that is, of more or less marginalised groups against the dominant political establishment. In practice, this has so meant not so much an alliance between the radical left and the radical right as an alliance between religious conservatives (mainly Muslim and Orthodox) and ex-communists. A good example of this in western Europe is Alain Soral's "Égalité et réconciliation" ("Equality and Reconciliation"), which attempts to build an alliance between Muslim immigrants and French patriots. The name of Soral's movement already makes it clear that a critique of egalitarianism is not part of the agenda. Neither is racialism or racially-based nationalism. Dugin, too, avoids any critique of egalitarianism, downplaying the real differences between left and right by focusing entirely on attacking "liberalism". The concept of "liberalism" - intentionally left ambiguous, referring at times to capitalist economic individualism, at times to the moral individualism of gay rights activists and secularists - functions as a central pole of opposition that is supposed to artificially unify into a single (purely utopian) front groups that are otherwise profoundly heterogenous.

Dugin, who calls for a "crusade against the West" is not opposed to liberalism because it is causing the destruction of the white race. On the contrary, he frequently seems to identify the former with the latter. His primary stated goal is to destroy liberalism, even if this should mean rejecting the white race along with it. As he puts it in "The Fourth Political Theory": "liberalism (and post-liberalism) may (and must - I believe this!) be repudiated. And if behind it, there stands the full might of the inertia of modernity, the spirit of Enlightenment and the logic of the political and economic history of European

humanity of the last centuries, it must be repudiated together with modernity, the Enlightenment, and European humanity altogether. Moreover, only the acknowledgement of liberalism as fate, as a fundamental influence, comprising the march of Western European history, will allow us really to say 'no' to liberalism" ["The Fourth Political Theory", p. 154]. He also defines the race of the subject of the "fourth political theory" as "non-White/European" [Ibid. p. 189]. He has predicted world-wide anti-white pogroms as retribution for the evil deeds of the white race, pogroms that Russians, however, will be exempt from, since they are not, he says [Russian language link], fully white.

In other words, Dugin is not a white nationalist. Dugin has stated that he views race as a social construct. This may seem to us like a ludicrous claim, but we may assume that he is not simply being disingenuous. It is consistent with his postmodern and relativist theoretical orientation, as well as with statements he has previously made to the effect that the idea of white racial solidarity is both unrealistic and potentially dangerous:

"When it comes to the myth of 'the solidarity of the white race', it is a complete utopia that leads not only to the Holocaust of the Jews, but also to a genocide of the Slavs. The remains of the Third Reich are a basis for this miserable, contradictory and completely false conception. The Anglo-Saxon world is one sociopolitical and cultural reality. The inhabitants of Central Europe are something different. The Eastern world of Orthodox Christianity and Slavs is a third reality. I am certain that many non-white peoples of Eurasia are a thousand fold closer to us in spirit and culture than Americans."

[Alexander Dugin, "The Magic Disillusion of a Nationalist Intellectual"].

In other words, Dugin holds the view - shared by many Jews - that any form of positive racial identity among whites will inevitably and fatally lead to "a new holocaust".

Presumably, Dugin follows Alain de Benoist in viewing the concept of race - and the phenomenon of racism - as a product of the Enlightenment, a modern phenomenon, and for Dugin, "modern" always means "bad". Alain de Benoist is correct that the concept of race was first formulated in the context of the Enlightenment. This does not in itself constitute sufficient grounds for rejecting the concept of race. Even before the concept of race was formed, race was a biological fact, just as DNA existed before being discovered by scientists. It may be that as a social and linguistic constructivist, Dugin would contest the idea that race can exist in the absence of a concept of race. Philosophically, Dugin takes the view that nothing has being outside of language and social relations. Relativism, which is characteristic of postmodernism, is according to Dugin, philosophically compatible with traditionalism, since, he claims that "[f]rom the point of view of the 'integral tradition', the difference between 'artificial' and 'natural' is generally rather relative, as Tradition never knew anything similar to cartesian or kantian dualism,

strictly separating the 'subjective' from the 'objective' ["From Sacred Geography to Geopolitics"]. Dugin tries to interpret postmodernity - with its relativist critique the universalism of the enlightenment Reason, in other words of the basis of the project of modernity - as opening the way to a resurgence of traditional, pre-modern, pre-rationalistic modes of thought. Dugin's relativist approach is integral to the entire project of the "fourth political theory", since it is the philosophical basis for the idea of an ethno-pluralistic, multipolar world.

It may be that Dugin subscribes to the idea that in order for the biological concept of race to be meaningful, that is, in order for it to be possible to categorise individuals as belonging to a certain race, there must exist a racially pure individual who could embody a standard of comparison, an ideal norm. Since on a genetic level, there are arguably no such individuals, the concept of race is supposedly deprived of its scientific foundation and revealed to have only a social meaning.

Since Dugin views race as a construct, he can freely manipulate and extend the concept of "racism" to include various forms of discrimination that are not normally included under this term: cultural, civilisational, technological, social, economic, and even glamour and fashion racism. The concept of "racism" is stretched and expanded (simply becoming synonymous with discrimination on the basis of norms that are subjective or relative) to the point that almost anyone can claim to be the victim of it. Defining racism as "any attempt to raise a subjective assessment to the status of a theory", he can claim that not only nazism and fascism, but also communism and liberalism are racist, since they posit a certain political subject as normative (the proletariat or the enlightened, bourgeois individual). There are indubitably racist elements in the writings of Marx. He viewed colonialism favourably, as a means of modernising and industrialising non-European nations, which was a necessary pre-condition for the final transition to communism. He was also convinced that some races were doomed to perish, since they were inherently incapable of surviving the inevitable historical progression to communism.

Dugin also turns anti-racism against modernity and progressivism. It is "racist", for example, to judge black African or middle eastern immigrants negatively for their inability to adapt to a modern, technologically advanced Western societies. In fact, the traditional views of Arabs and Africans with regard to women, homosexuality, the raising of children - as well as their rejection of evolution and religious views - is viewed by Dugin as, if anything, a sign of their spiritual superiority. Moreover, he sees the idea of progress itself as inherently racist, since it implies that modern society (which means Western society) is normative and superior to non-Western, traditional societies. The latter, he says, should not be regarded as stuck in archaic social forms because they lack creativity or the ability to build civilisations. On the contrary, it is because they are more spiritual and have conserved tradition better than the white race.

From the perspective of the modern West, all societies are inherently striving towards the normative type of Western modern society, but have simply not yet succeeded in achieving it. Rightists explain this failure as the proof of the racial inferiority of non-Western populations, while leftists explain it as the consequence of colonial exploitation and western imperialism. Both share the implicit premise that Western modernity represents the most advanced and desirable form of society. It is certainly true that in Western societies, "modern" tends to be a positively charged term. It is more or less synonymous with dynamic, youthful, enlightened and "open-minded". It is the anthropological norm, in the sense that those who either reject it or fail in some way to live up to it are judged negatively as being backwards, stupid, socially unpresentable, etc. This is undoubtedly a social - and consequently also political - disadvantage for conservatives of all types, one that they share with non-Western immigrants in Western societies. Dugin concludes from this that conservatives should ally themselves with immigrants, especially Muslim immigrants, against the liberal, white establishment (NOT the Jewish establishment - Dugin doesn't believe that Jews are responsible for Western decadence, he believes that Western "decadence" is simply the full manifestation of the essence of the West and the wicked nature of the white race).

However much even the most "progressive" Westerners may try to rid themselves of racism and racist exclusion, in a mechanism that psychoanalysts call "the return of the repressed", it keeps sneaking back in through the back door, taking on new, unconscious forms, so that, as Dugin correctly observes, even political correctness itself is "transformed into a totalitarian discipline of political, purely racist exclusions." Not only white "racists" but religious conservatives and nationalists are subjected - with complete impunity - to forms of social exclusion, aggression, openly exhibited contempt, bullying, physical and psychological violence that are clearly an acting out of precisely those patterns of behaviour that in all other contexts are denounced as "racist". These groups, which are often made up of the "underdogs" of white society, the socially and economically most vulnerable groups, including the working class, the unemployed, inhabitants of rural areas and pensioners, are routinely spat upon by the establishment, its journalists and its "intellectuals" as culturally, morally, intellectually, and even biologically deficient ("white trash", "inbred", and so on).

Dugin's mania with denouncing racism looks suspiciously like an intentional parody of contemporary political correctness, which sees discriminating norms everywhere, and it is possible that while accepting the postmodern deconstruction of the concept of race, he intends to turn it into a deconstruction of the term "racism" itself, extending the term ad absurdum, to the point of emptying it of meaning and turning it against itself. Rather than attempting, the way most conservatives do, to resist postmodern relativism by upholding certain absolute moral norms, the authority of the western tradition and universal, objective standards of rationality, his strategy appears to be to overcome the last residues of modern ideological presuppositions by pushing them to their extreme, postmodern conclusions.

However, in "The Fourth Political Theory, Dugin condemns racism, and above all, German national socialism, not only on epistemological grounds, but also on moral grounds. Dugin's condemnation of the moral consequences racism is simply taken as axiomatic and not subjected to any philosophical criticism. It is not clear on what moral basis this condemnation of Western racism is compatible with absolute cultural relativism, the denial that there is any universal point of view from which normative judgments about other cultures could be made (including moral judgments). Are slavery and genocide only morally reprehensible when committed by modern Westerners, but not when committed by other groups? Dugin apparently thinks so, as is shown by the following statement he has made on Facebook about the enslavement and exploitation (as food!) of black Africans by other black Africans:

"There are African tribes in West-Atlantic shore who breed human slaves to eat them. I find it perfectly reasonable and fully responsible. If we kill animals by our hands, contemplate them suffering and dying, cut off their skin and separate bones, touching their inner organs -- or at least if we vividly imagine that act each time when we eat our meal, we are completely sane and we could proceed eventually applying - in wars -- the same attitude toward human. In the war it is essential to take responsibility of act of killing. The very similar responsibility is connected with the act of eating animal food. But animal signifies sentient, that presupposes suffering. Let us do it with full responsibility -- eating as well as fighting, in one word -- the responsibility of killing. Or abstain. It is free choice."

We may assume that this is a sincere statement and not simply a banal attempt at "shocking the bourgeois". It is completely consistent with Dugin's position of cultural relativism (the claim that all normative statements about other cultures must be suspended, since there are no universal norms on the basis of which such statements could be made), although we may ask ourselves how this kind of moral relativism is philosophically consistent with his claim to be a Christian. Dugin is apparently criticising bourgeois moral hypocrisy, that is, the failure to take responsibility for the killing and exploitation that are the conditions that make bourgeois society possible. Dugin continues like this:

"To kill or not kill (to eat or not to eat): 'do what thou wilt' but never lie. (Continuing vegetarian/cannibal topic). What is good or bad depends on the set of the values accepted in the society. We live in one society the other people live in other. Every society kills, murders and commits the acts of violence - on the human beings or animals. But some societies recognize that and embed the death, killing and violence in their sacred concepts. The other societies, making just the same or worse hypocritically, deny that, appealing to non-violence, tolerance and promoting peace via murder and war. So I don't judge the violence in itself that depends on the culture - some cultures sacralize it some not - but each human group commits the same acts - kill, torture and eat. So I have only pointed out that it is the fact. The peoples who do it consciously are more civilized and cultivated, more honest and spiritually developed, less infantile and more grown up than those who commit the same act without noticing it or denying its cannibal nature. The world is build on the act of killing (and eating) - God - Man - beast. That is the sense

of priesthood. The priest is primordial killer. So existence is painful. We must accept it as it is. We cause pain, we feel pain. It is quite normal situation. The cannibalism is not 'disgusting exception' and 'horrible sign of moral depravity'. In some way it is natural. Indian tradition affirms that 'kshatriya eat vaishyas'. Vedic hymns are full of the eating (killing, devouring) metaphors. I only try to stress that we are responsible of what we eat, of whom we kill and destroy. The African and Oceanian tribes give us example that I find beautiful and pure."

Given that he accepts moral relativism, it is not clear how Dugin can consistently condemn the national socialist extermination and enslavement of Slavs or Jews, or, for that matter, the enslavement and genocide of other populations by European colonists - none of which is by any means historically unique to Western Europeans (cf., for example, the Old Testament). What moral universal standard is he referring to? The ideology of universal human rights? Probably not. Christian morality, which he refuses to apply to West African cannibals and slave traders? It is also not clear how he can accuse racists of inconsistency, since not all aggressive racial supremacists are inconsistent or hypocritical about their intentions. Finally, it is not clear at all how Dugin can without hypocrisy condemn national socialism from a moral standpoint while at the same time rehabilitating figures like Stalin and Pol Pot as "national communists".

Although Dugin views "racism" as a typically Western "disease", it is not particularly difficult to find examples of it among non-Western and traditional or archaic societies, especially if we define "racism" as "viewing one's own ethnic group as normative". This is particularly true of tribal societies, where the name of the tribe will often simply be the word for "humanity", and members of other tribes are viewed as more or less non-human or sub-human. For example:

"An instructive case is that of the Yanoama of the Amazon basin, who not only call themselves 'humanity' (the meaning of their name) and all others 'lesser subhuman beings' (nabä) but carry the process still further: members of one Yanoama village habitually accentuate the minor differences of dialect (or the like) that separates them from residents of other villages; then they deride the others for being less than fully Yanoama, which is to say, somewhat subhuman."

[Bruce Lincoln, "Death, War and Sacrifice: Studies in Ideology and Practice", p. 142]

Moreover, he makes no distinction between the recognition of race as a reality and racism in the sense of racial supremacism. An example of imperialist racism (white supremacism) would be the following statement by Winston Churchill from 1937:

"I do not agree that the dog in a manger has the final right to the manger even though he may have lain there for a very long time. I do not admit that right. I do not admit for instance, that a great wrong has been done to the Red Indians of America or the black people of Australia. I do not admit that a wrong has been done to these people by the fact that a stronger race, a higher-grade race, a more worldly wise race to put it that way, has come in and taken their place."

The vast majority of American "white nationalists" or European ethno-nationalists today are, however, far less "racist" or "white supremacist" than Winston Churchill. Even those who do believe that the white race is innately superior to other races, as opposed to merely recognising the reality of racial specificity, do not usually see this as being a moral justification of the enslavement or genocide of other races. For the most part, contemporary racialists merely assert the right to racial separatism and the right of each race to build a society adequate to itself and to cultivate its unique characteristics and potentialities.

As for the historical validity of Dugin's interpretation of national socialism as a project of world domination (the creation of a "planetary Reich" analogous to world communism or global liberalism), it is debatable to say the least. Certainly the pursuit of world domination was not a universally accepted idea among national socialists, as this statement by Léon Degrelle demonstrates:

"German racialism has been deliberately distorted. It never was anti-"other -race" racialism. It was a pro-German racialism. It was concerned with making the German race strong and healthy in every way. Hitler was not interested in having millions of degenerates, if it was his power not to have them. Today one finds rampant alcohol and drug addiction everywhere. Hitler cared that the German families be healthy, cared that they raise healthy children for the renewal of a healthy nation. German racialism meant re-discovering the creative values of their own race, re-discovering their culture. It was a search for excellence, a noble ideal. National Socialist racialism was not against the other races, it was for its own race. It aimed at defending and improving its race, and wished that all other races did the same for themselves."

The claim that there is no biological basis for the concept of race, or that it is not useful in explaining contemporary reality, is of course patently false. But Dugin follows postmodern thinkers like Foucault and Althusser in arguing that not only race, but all political subjects are constructs. Race is a product of society, rather than society a product of race. Man, he argues, exists as a subject only within the political realm. "What man is, is not derived from himself as an individual, but from politics. It is politics that defines the man. It is the political system that gives us our shape. Moreover, the political system has an intellectual and conceptual power, as well as transformative potential without limitations [169]." In

other words, the subject does not create itself, nor is it a natural given like race or the individual. The subject is a construct, existing only within a political system.

It follows that ultimately, there is no master subject who creates or exercises conspiratorial control over the system. On the contrary: subjects exist only as functions, produced by subjectless political structures. As the political system changes, shifting from one historical paradigm to another - from traditional society to modern society, for example - it constructs the normative type of subjectivity it requires to function. "[T]he political concept of man is the concept of man as such, which is installed in us by the state or the political system. The political man is a particular means of correlating man with this state and political system. [...] We believe we are *causa sui*, generated within ourselves, and only then do we find ourselves within the sphere of politics. In fact, it is politics that constitutes us. [...] Man's anthropological structure shifts when one political system changes to another." [169]. In other words, the subject cannot bring about a political paradigm shift on its own - it is the new paradigm that will call a new subject into being through a process of "interpellation". The study of the anthropological shift from the type of man belonging to traditional society to the type of man belonging to modern society leads to the relativisation not only of modern man, but of modern rationality as such. This relativisation of modernity is "postmodernity". The modern idea of progress towards a humanity unified on the basis of universal Reason is shown to be an illusion, and this implies that traditional societies are placed on the same level as modern society.

In a nutshell, the argument is as follows: the subject cannot radically break through the system (carry out a revolution or "paradigm shift") and go beyond it if it is itself a product of the system, only existing within the limits of that system. This was why class, race, and the individual, all of which are subjects constituted and defined within the horizon of modernity, failed to overcome the crisis and impasses of modernity. In other words, the subject would have to be grounded in a kind of Archimedean point outside of the political system, in order to have the leverage needed for any radical political agency. There would have to be a "radical subject", and for Dugin the "radical subject" can only be chaos. Chaos is freedom beyond its capture within the limits of the bourgeois, humanist conception of the individual. The shattering of the liberal individual is not the negation of freedom, but the revelation of the essence of freedom as anarchic, sovereign chaos.

The political subject acts within the realm of politics. Ideologically, however, it must be founded in a realm prior to and beyond the political. In other words, the subject of politics must transcend the sphere of politics in order to be able to master, define, and found it. For example, liberal ideology posits the existence of the individual prior to the existence of the social order, in order to found the political order on the individual and its universal, natural rights. Analogously, national socialists view race as a biological given existing prior to and beyond the political, and the state as possessing meaning only insofar as it is an instrument through which a race is protected, preserved and its potentialities are

actualised and enhanced. This means that for national socialists, race transcends the political realm, subordinating it to itself. The political consciousness they strive to awaken others to is racial self-consciousness, much as Marxists attempt to awaken the proletariat to class consciousness. For Marxists, the means of production transcend the political realm, forming its material basis and driving force. A class constitutes itself as a political subject by taking control of the means of production.

"The definition of a historical subject is the fundamental basis for political ideology in general, and defines its structure" (4PT, p. 38).

For example: for nationalism, the real subjects of history are nations, viewed as a sort of supra-individuals with a will and a destiny of their own. History is the history of nations. Identity is primarily national, and the friend/enemy distinction (which is constitutive for the political, as Carl Schmitt has shown) goes along national lines. For racism, on the other hand, the true subjects of history are the various races, locked in a Darwinian struggle for life. This view of history is determined by the modern concepts of biological evolution and progress. Identity is primarily racial, and the friend/enemy distinction goes along racial lines. For Marxism, the subjects of history are classes, again viewed as forms of collective subjectivity, and consequently, the whole of history was interpreted as the history of class struggle. Identity is class identity, and the friend/enemy distinction goes along class lines.

The political subject is also an historical subject. This means that each modern political ideology corresponds to a "grand narrative" - an over-arching interpretation - of history. History as a whole is viewed as created through the agency of a certain historical subject. It then becomes obvious that political ideologies are secular substitutes for a theological interpretation of history, and that the historical subjects posited by them are substitutes for divine Providence as the transcendent subject of history. As Carl Schmitt demonstrated, all the fundamental concepts of politics are secularised theological concepts.

The place of the political subject - the vacuum left when God withdraws from the world and history - is a site of contestation between the various modern political ideologies. Each of them fought to occupy that vacant place with their own concept of the political subject. Each of them claimed to master the destructive and creative forces liberated by modernity, bringing modernity to its full actualisation. Communism saw itself as the final, inevitable and culminating stage of modernity, for which industrial capitalism had only paved the way. Liberalism views the progressive liberation of the individual, along with the processes of secularisation, modernisation and globalisation, as an historical necessity. Fascism saw itself as an avant-garde, revolutionary movement, dismissed liberal, bourgeois democracy as an outdated residue of the nineteenth century, and claimed that the organic state was the only adequate form through which the masses could be mobilised in modern societies. Both Italian fascism and German national socialism modernised and revolutionised their respective nations, and this contributed

to their political success. Early fascism was influenced by the avant-garde modernism of futurism, which called for the nihilistic destruction of the past and unconditionally worshipped modern technology and "progress".

(This lead Evola to reject futurism as a form of "Americanism". Marinetti retorted that he had as little in common with Evola as with "an Eskimo". Bizarrely - for someone who claims to be a traditionalist - Dugin views futurism as one of the admirable elements of early fascism that he wishes to recuperate.)

Each of these political systems, then, claimed that it was the most appropriate form for modern, technologically advanced society. This form corresponded to a certain figure or human type, an embodiment of a certain political project, the normative "man of the future": whether homo sovieticus, the new fascist man, the racially purified Aryan superman, or the enlightened, bourgeois individual. In other words, each of these ideologies or "political theories" posited a normative subject as the basis of its political vision and its interpretation of history. The transition into fully realised modernity was not only a political revolution, but also an anthropological revolution, the creation of a "new man".

According to Dugin, in the crisis of the end of modernity, not only race and class, but also the nation-state ceases to be an authentic political subject, even though he recognises that the will to preserve national sovereignty is, in the current situation, a natural locus of resistance to globalism. The de-sovereignisation of the nation is, philosophically speaking, its de-subjectivisation. However, Dugin sees this de-sovereignisation/de-subjectivisation as inevitable, even inherent in the nature of the nation itself. He fully accepts the postmodern idea that the nation is an artificial, ideological and political construct, an "imagined community" created as a means of unifying fragmented, modern societies. The nation is, in his view, merely a simulacrum, an artificial substitute for the lost totality of traditional society (presumably, he views race similarly, as being a modern simulacrum of the "ethnos"). Historically, its emergence corresponds to the precise moment when traditional society enters into crisis. It is a compromise, a transitional form, a ruse. Moreover, he views the function of the nation as a device for facilitating the transition from pre-modern, traditional society to fully modern, liberal, civil society. As a result, it cannot constitute an enduring force of resistance to liberal globalisation. He views the nation as a dispositive of power geared to producing a certain standardised, normative type of political subject: the bourgeois individual (citizen). In doing so, it destroys regional, organic, ethnic communities (for example, through the suppression of regional dialects in Italy and France, and the imposition of a standardised national language) as well as liquidating the last residues of traditional elites (the aristocracy). Thus, the concept of "ethno-nationalism" is, in his view, ultimately an absolute contradiction in terms: the nation is inherently "ethnocidal" . It destroys the ethnos and replaces it with a "demos". Nationalism, according to Dugin, must be condemned not just because it has been the cause of so many wars, but because the nation itself is inherently violent - violent in the sense that it is an arbitrary construct without any sacred, transcendent basis. Its violence is the violence of modernity

itself. (Certainly, this is true of many nations, perhaps most notably of the nation of Israel, which is an entirely modern, artificial construction, as is perhaps the idea that Jews are a unified, homogenous race or ethnic group.) Nothing, however, so far indicates that the idea of Eurasian empire dominated by Russia would be less artificial, violent or “ethnocidal”.

(The new European post-war order projected by the dominant faction of the Waffen SS was not based on the nation-state, but on a pan-European federation of culturally autonomous regions. Dugin fails to mention this fact, but his characterisation of National Socialism is tendentious.)

As for the fascist concept of the organic state, based on Hegel's philosophy of the state, Dugin does not discuss his reasons for rejecting it as a credible candidate for the political subject. In general, Dugin simply takes the defeat of both the second and third political theories as axiomatic, without providing much in the way of substantial argument for this. In his view, modernity has been fully actualised in liberal society, and consequently, the ideological contest of modernity is over. This view is more credible with regard to communism than with regard to fascism. The death of communism was, as Dominique Venner has written, an “inglorious demise”. Its collapse was due to its own bureaucratic inertia and failure to manage economic development. Fascism and national socialism, on the other hand, were spectacularly successful as political experiments, and, perhaps for this very reason, had to be militarily destroyed by their international rivals. Dugin clearly views the defeat of national socialist Germany as a consequence of its anti-Russian and anti-communist policies. Since Dugin views both of these policies as connected with the infection of national socialism by Atlanticism and Anglo-Saxon, biological racism, he views the defeat of the third position as a consequence of ideological errors, and not simply as an historical contingency. Not only was Nazi Nordicism a vulgar, materialist misinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the north as the pole of tradition, national socialism was anti-communist and anti-Slavic because it was anti-Eastern, that is, pro-Western (modern). Today, according to Eurasianists (who in this respect are inheritors of national bolshevism), European nationalists are repeating the disastrous errors of the German national socialists when they again oppose “the East” in the form of Islamisation. Generally, Eurasianists try to downplay the idea of a “clash of civilisations” or any claim that there is a sharp opposition between Islam and European civilisation. They accuse nationalists who view Islam as incompatible with European values of confusing “Europe” with “the West”. Any interpretation of European history that sees enlightenment values as rooted in the European tradition itself - in classical Greece, for example - is accused of trying to legitimate “the West” by inventing historical precedents and falsifying the true European tradition, which is rooted in Eurasia and not at all opposed to Islam.

Liberalism has triumphed because it can legitimately lay claim to being the most successful actualisation of the potentialities of modernity. Liberalism did indeed succeed in modernising the West to a much greater degree than communism succeeded in modernising the countries of the Eastern bloc, so much

so that "the West", and particularly the United States, is today more or less synonymous with modernity. In the decades after the second world war, capitalism, using economic means, modernised Western European societies to a degree undreamed of by fascism, making the third position ideologies seem archaic and obsolete by comparison.

It is possible that Dugin follows Heidegger in viewing nationalism as an "anthropologism" (cf. "Letter on Humanism"). What Heidegger mean by this is that nationalism, like Marxism, places man, rather than Being, at the centre of history. Nationalism is a "subjectivism", in the sense that it views man as the subject of history. In this sense, nationalism is indeed a modern phenomenon, since modernity, for Heidegger, is essentially an epoch in the history of metaphysics dominated by the philosophy of the subject. It begins with Descartes' cogito: with the rational subject as the secure foundation of philosophy and science. Descartes identifies the subject with reason (ratio). This became the metaphysical foundation for the Enlightenment and its anthropology.

Why does Dugin give Heidegger's concept of "Dasein" the pivotal role in the "fourth political theory"? Heidegger elaborated his analysis of Dasein as an attempt to overcome the abstractions of the metaphysical concept of the subject. Hence, his "analytic of Dasein" offers the possibility of going beyond the modern political ideologies based on various interpretations of the subject. Dasein is beyond, or prior to, the subject-object split. Dasein is not the rational subject as the abstract basis of the concept of universal man. Dasein is the historical, spatio-temporal structure of concrete existence. The subject is outside of the world, relating to the world as a system of objects. Dasein is always already IN the world, involved in it, struggling within it. The world, as Heidegger uses the term, is a totality of relations of meaning. Each thing refers to other things in an endless, circular web of relations. Dasein's relation to things is one of understanding and interpretation, not (primarily) one of objectification.

The subject is reason, that is, it is defined by its relation to an ultimate cause and foundation (Grund). Dasein is defined by its relation to finitude, death and the abyss (Ab-grund). However, all this means that it is not clear how Dasein, which according to Heidegger is precisely NOT the subject, can be called "the subject" of the fourth political theory. Dasein is not a subject that arbitrarily imposes its will, creates itself from nothing or freely makes history. Instead, it is part of a cosmic process that transcends man and his agency. Man does not decide the history of Being. Heidegger is not interested in re-elaborating or modifying the concept of the subject, nor is he interested in returning man to "god and tradition" in the sense of metaphysical foundations, but is trying to overcome metaphysics itself, that is, all thinking in terms of the Being of beings as a "foundation" (Grund). This also means that Heidegger is far from the conceptions of "traditionalism".

If Dugin invokes Heidegger and the analytic of Dasein, we must assume that behind the critique of liberalism and the West, he is attempting a critique of modernity as such (identified with the West). Heidegger's critique of modernity is linked to an attempt to overcome the philosophy of the subject. In Heidegger's view, modernity, when the humanitarian masks of the Enlightenment fall off, is technological nihilism, and this nihilism is the fatal consequence of Western metaphysics. Western metaphysics, however, is the basis of Western civilisation as a whole.

Heidegger's critique is not simply political. He is criticising Bolshevism, liberalism (which paved the way for Bolshevism) and other modern ideologies for failing to grasp not only their own essence, but the essence of modernity itself: technological nihilism. The emancipation of the subject is not the purpose of technological development. It is the other way around - the emancipation of the the subject is a means through which technology emancipates itself. The last glimmers of transcendence are extinguished from the world so that technology can pursue, unobstructed and on a planetary scale, the endless, circular self-enhancement of its productive power, drawing everything into its vortex, with no ultimate goal other than power for its own sake. The West becomes "das Abendland", the evening-land, the realm of the darkening of the divine, the withdrawal of the gods. Technology as "Ge-stell" is not mastered by man (the subject), but reveals itself to be an impersonal destiny of Being itself. Man as a subject can never master technology, but as a subject is "subjected" by technology, to the extent that the essence of technology as Gestell constitutes man as a subject. Technological development has no intrinsic, immanent limit, and no boundary can be arbitrarily set to it as long as thinking remains blocked within the horizon of the philosophy of the subject (humanism) and of technological calculation (the final deviation of the Western logos). But as modern technology reaches the full actualisation of its dominion, the subject that it once called into being enters into crisis, begins to "vanish". It is liquidated in a system of purely functional relations without centre, fixed norms or foundations. The essence of the subject reveals itself to be a kind of limit, which initially functioned as a necessary ground or condition, but now becomes only an obstacle to be overcome. For Heidegger, this crisis, this ultimate threshold of nihilism - brought about by technology itself - opens up the possibility of thinking the essence of man and Being in a much deeper dimension, beyond the subject. Instead of man as subject, Heidegger tries to think the historicity of Dasein. This is why the "inner truth" of national socialism for him meant the confrontation between modern technology and "historical man" (that is, not man as subject).

For Heidegger, Western modernity and materialism are not, as traditionalists claim, the consequence of a mysterious fall from the normal, traditional society of medieval Europe. On the contrary, he views the transition from the Middle Ages to the modern age more as a development than as a radical break with the traditional past. For Heidegger, medieval scholasticism, with its misinterpretation of the Greek logos as "ratio" and its onto-theological synthesis of Greek philosophy with Christianity, prepared the way for Descartes' rationalism. In a sense, Heidegger develops Nietzsche's idea that nihilism is not so much a break with Christianity, but a revelation of the nihilistic essence of Christianity. As a Christian and a traditionalist, however, Dugin consistently elides the anti-Christian aspect of Heidegger's thought,

without, however, being able to articulate a critique of it. For Heidegger, as for the majority of the conservative revolutionaries, the origin of modernity is Christian, or rather, it lies in the "onto-theological" synthesis of Christianity and Greek metaphysics. It is the Christian conception of the "sovereignty" of God with regard to the world as creation that is at the origin of the modern concept of the subject, just as the Christian notion of the free individual with a personal relation to God and the Christian concern with the salvation of the immortal soul of all individuals is the origin of modern mass individualism. It is God as the "highest being" - both *causa sui* and *causa prima*, the first cause, sovereign over all other beings and the "maker" of the world - that is at the origin of the sovereign subject whose relation to things is one of instrumental manipulation and objectification. Modern secular humanism is onto-theological: it has its origin not in Greek thought, but in Christianity and the Christian interpretation of Greek thought.

In any case, following Heidegger, we may agree that race, insofar as it is conceived as a purely human, biological characteristic, is insufficient as a political subject, or rather, that it is too narrowly anthropological, and must be integrated into a deeper conception. This is not the same as liquidating the concept of race completely. It does mean the rejection of certain extreme forms of racism, where the biological concept of race plays an analogous reductive role to the Marxist concept of a material base that determines the ideological superstructure (culture, mentality etc.) of a society.

Man is not the unconditioned, self-creating subject of modern metaphysics. Human existence is conditioned and finite - men are, as Jünger wrote, "sons of the earth". Race is one of the many earthly conditions of man's existence. An historical world is not an unconditioned, arbitrary construct *ex nihilo*. There is, in Heidegger's terms, a struggle between world and earth - the world, an articulated, historical space of possibilities and decisions, and the conditions set by the un-objectified, elemental forces of the earth, among them blood. Blood is given the meaning of a destiny in an historical world (this is not at all the same as claiming that it is an arbitrary historical and social construct). For Heidegger, the limits set by the biological potentialities of human beings are not arbitrary historical creations - what is historical is the particular figure or constellation of relations that gives them meaning.

We can also note that the statistical concept of race referred to by race realists today is very different from national socialist racial theories, which were based on the idea of racial purity, and are, in the form in which they are available today, are not on their own sufficient to non-reductively account for the specificity of our or other civilisations or cultures. The differences between the mentality of Americans of European descent, on the one hand, and the mentality of Europeans, on the other, underscores this clearly. Intuitively, however, we understand that race plays a role in shaping the general character of civilisations, and that genetic research will confirm this intuition more and more in the future.

Dugin views the Marxist concept of class as useful and "very interesting" as a tool for the ideological critique of the mystifications of bourgeois-liberal society. However, he views the materialism of Marxism as reductive, and recognises that class today is no longer a credible candidate for political subjectivity (i. e., agency), since the class structure of society has been largely dissolved (presumably as the result of the atomisation and bourgeoisification of society as a whole, as well as technological developments). He also recognises that ethnic conflict often lies behind class conflict, instead of the other way around. One wonders why Dugin cannot, in the same spirit, acknowledge that the concept of race also is scientifically legitimate and heuristically useful, while rejecting an overly reductive application of the concept. In my view, this has to do with the fact that he is an ideologist rather than an authentic thinker. Eurasianism is an ideology tailor-made to suit contemporary Russia's geopolitical ambitions. Russia is a multi-cultural, multi-racial empire, and Russian identity is, since "the great patriotic war" against Germany, deeply anti-fascist.

Race, "Ethnos" and "The Fourth Political Theory" - Part 2

By Giuliano Adriano Malvicini

Part 2 of 3

Since liberalism, as an ideology founded on the rights of the individual, calls for "the liberation from all forms of collective identity in general, (and is therefore) entirely incompatible with the ethnos and ethnocentrism, and is an expression of a systematic theoretical and technological ethnocide", "ethnocentrism" and the positive affirmation of "ethnic" identity are viewed by Dugin as a potential base for resistance to liberalism. This is why he argues that "ethnocentrism" can be viewed as a positive component of national socialism, if it is neutralised by purging it of any racial or national connotations. Dugin's notion of "ethnos" has nothing to do with race - he makes it very clear that it is a purely cultural, linguistic and sociological concept with no biological basis whatsoever. As we shall see, Dugin's concept of "ethnocentrism", which he says is derived from the German sociologist Wilhelm Mühlmán (who, however, was a convinced racist and national socialist), differs from the commonly accepted meaning of this term. As for the concept of the "ethnos" itself, in "The Fourth Political Theory" he only touches upon it in passing, defining it as "a community of language, religious belief, daily life, and the sharing of resources and goals". However, he develops it much more fully in a lecture series on "ethno-sociology" (a term that means the same as cultural or social anthropology, ethnology or structural anthropology), which can be viewed on Youtube.

The first part of Dugin's course is a very summary overview of different national schools of social anthropology, which he sees as an important peripheral scientific discipline that has the potential to challenge and subvert Western cultural hegemony (i. e., Western "racism"). Those familiar with the work of Kevin McDonald and his book "The Culture of Critique" will be struck Dugin's very positive

evaluation of figures like the Jewish-American anthropologist Franz Boas, who is famous for having tried to debunk the concept of race.

Dugin is especially interested in the French school of structural anthropology, founded by the Jewish-French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, who was a student of the Jewish-Russian linguist Roman Jakobson. This connection is important to Dugin, since Jakobson was not only one of the founders of the structuralist school in linguistics, but also a Eurasianist. Structuralist anthropology is also an important link between the study of pre-modern forms of rationality and poststructuralist thought, and between "holistic" conservative thought and postmodern relativism. The structuralist method - viewing a culture as a system of synchronic relations - is assimilated by Dugin to the holistic, organic view of society characteristic of conservative thinkers. Dugin also says that his concept of "ethnos" based on the work of the Russian ethnologist Sergey Shirokogorov, who studied archaic tribes living on the Siberian tundra.

Shirokogorov's work also functions as a link between the concept of "ethnos" and the political ideology of Eurasianism.

Dugin has proposed the "ethnos" and "civilisation" as possible subjects of the "fourth political theory". For Dugin, the "ethnos", and not the individual, is the social "atom" (the simplest, most basic form of social being). The "ethnos" is only fully embodied by primitive hunter-gatherer societies and neolithic agrarian societies. The ethnos, again, is not a racial group. The essence of the "ethnos", as Dugin defines this term, is not a biological fact, but a social, symbolic and linguistic structure. He is always careful to emphasise that the ethnos is a cultural phenomenon, not defined by blood relations or race. It is similar to the phenomenological concept of a pre-logical "life world" (Lebenswelt). The "life world" is pre-logical in the sense that it is the shared horizon of understanding of a community. The notion of life world allows Dugin to link the concept of "ethnos" to Heidegger's concept of Dasein as being-in-the-world. This is important because Dasein is supposed to be the "subject" of the fourth political theory. The ethnos, then, is apparently a specific type of Dasein.

Although the notion of ethnos is only fully applicable to archaic societies, it continues to exist as a residual stratum in modern societies, in the form of the timeless symbols and archetypes of the collective unconscious. In modern society, the ethnic life-world has disintegrated and society is increasingly transformed into an economic system governed by instrumental, technological rationality. By taking the ethnos as a paradigm of interpretation, it is set up as the "normal" type of society, and modern society is viewed as a deviation from or distortion of this original standard. The methods of social anthropology, developed specifically for the study of primitive societies, can then be used as a critical tool in the interpretation of modern societies - something already attempted by semioticians like Roland Barthes and Jean Baudrillard. The non-individualist, non-utilitarian gift economies of primitive

societies, based on symbolic exchange and honour, are presented as a possible basis for an economic system that could be an alternative to modern liberal-capitalist economies.

The ethnos itself cannot be properly understood using historical methods. One of the characteristics of archaic, primitive societies is that they are ahistorical, or prehistorical. They lack written records. They live in mythical time rather than historical time - mythical time in Mircea Eliade's sense, the time of the eternal return of the same. The ethnos (primitive society) is not an historical community but a social structure that reproduces itself indefinitely.

This means that it must be studied using the methods of structuralism, which were initially developed within the field of linguistics but later applied to the social sciences. Structuralists view primitive societies as systems of oppositions that must be studied holistically and synchronically, like a language. They cannot be adequately interpreted in causal terms, whether as the result of biological evolution (Dugin rejects evolutionary interpretations of culture as tainted by the "racist", modern doctrine of progress) or as arising from historical processes. The ethnos is simply a phenomenological given. Although it frequently seems to be a purely theoretical, artificial and utopian construct, Dugin insists that it is empirically validated by ethnological studies of archaic societies.

Instead of historical terms, the ethnos must be interpreted in spatial (synchronic) terms. The spatial structure of the ethnos, however, is first of all an expression of the specific landscape in which it dwells. The landscape should not be understood in simply material or naturalistic terms. The landscape of the ethnos is a sacred landscape. It is not just the natural environment of a tribal group, but the symbolic, mythical space into which the natural environment is inscribed. The concept of "nature", even in its anti-modern, romantic form, already presupposes man's separation and alienation from the cosmos as a primordial whole. The world of naive, primitive man, of the ethnos, is a whole prior to conceptual oppositions like artificial and natural, subject and object, symbolic and the real, language and things, thought and experience, the individual and society (and in this sense, it shares characteristics with the postmodern world, in which the boundaries between the virtual and the real, the natural and the technological are erased).

What Heidegger calls "a world" is a space of possibilities rather than a collection of objects observed from the outside. There is no independently existing, transcendental subject that subsequently crosses over into the world, no objective world that confronts a detached, abstract subject. Being-in-the-world comes first, and the subject and its "sense-data" are only abstracted out of it by philosophers. The opposition of subject and object conceals the primordial unity of being-in-the-world, which is irreducible

to the subject-object relation. Concrete being-in-the-world is studied phenomenologically, uncovering its temporal and spatial structure.

The fundamental polarity of the ethnos is not that between the subject and object, but between the sacred and the profane. The polarity between the sacred and the profane corresponds to the polarity between the exceptional and the normal. The profane is the normal, and the sacred is a crisis in the normal course of events - an exception that suspends the oppositions that structure social reality, transcending them and tracing their limits. The sacred is both exceptional and foundational, both dangerous and salvific ("Wo aber Gefahr ist, wächst/Das Rettende auch"). It is the outer limit of the world, but also the dark core of things. The sacred marks the uncrossable limits of communal life - uncrossable insofar as the one who crosses them, ceases to be part of the community, or becomes other (for example, by undergoing initiation). The sacred is a paradigm common to nature and society, designating the primordial totality that transcends them and includes them. The sacred is normative in the sense that it is a limit that unites and gathers all the separate regions of the world, determining their "measures". The dimension of the sacred belongs to the structure of Being itself, and can therefore never be entirely eliminated, even in the most secularised of modern societies: it can only be displaced and distorted.

The space of the ethnos is structured by the relation between a sacred centre (pole) and a profane margin. Here, Dugin draws on Mircea Eliade's work on the symbolism of the centre. According to Eliade, sacred space is founded and ordered from out of a central point marked by a "hierophany": a revelation of the sacred. The centre is symbolically designated by the erection of an axis mundi, an axis that connects the various dimensions or regions of the cosmos. Space, then, is not homogenous, but differentiated by a central, vertical sacred axis or core and a profane, horizontal periphery or margin. Traditional cosmogonies frequently describe the cosmos as growing out of a central point. As Eliade defines it, the centre is any point at which a vertical movement between different ontological planes or cosmic regions - between profane and sacred space, between heaven and earth, gods and mortals, the realm of the living and of the dead - can occur. It is the world-pillar, the sacred mountain - Yggdrasil, Olympus, Meru, Irminsul. Climbing a mountain, a cosmic tree or pillar is a passage from one ontological plane to another. Yggdrasil connects the nine worlds to each other and makes it possible to travel between them. The sacred centre is also the spinal column of the yogi, the Vedic sacrificial pole, a lingam, or a sacred tree. It is the gathering symbol of the Christian cross. It is the altar upon which the redemptive sacrificial death of Christ is re-enacted, and churches and temples are oriented around the centrality of the altar. The axis is the totem pole, the "master signifier" that gathers the tribe around itself. A cornerstone or the central column of a building is another embodiment of the sacred centre. The axis unites within itself the symbolism of transcendence and of foundation. It is the column that supports the "house of Being". The centre makes it possible for man to dwell in the world (the English word "home" is a cognate of the Old Norse word heimr, "world"), it is the pole that gathers, unifies and orders a cosmos. According to Eliade, its "temporal" counterpart is the sun at its zenith - which for

Nietzsche was a symbol of the revelation of the unity of Being and Becoming in eternal cosmic recurrence.

While modern society revolves around the pole of the "sacred" and inviolable individual, each ethnos is gathered around a sacred axis. The ethnos views itself as dwelling near the sacred centre of the world. It is the proximity to this point of origin, this source of power and pole of attraction that roots the ethnos in a landscape. It is not primarily defined by borders - by the exclusion of an "other", an enemy - but by the centripetal attraction of a pole of transcendence.

Each civilisation, while encompassing several ethne, is also organised around a pole, which presumably forms one of the poles of multipolarity. Dugin says that the symbol of Eurasianism, eight arrows radiating out from a central point, is a symbol of the ethno-centre. The radiating arrows are not only a symbol of Russian ambitions of imperialist expansion. They also symbolise the origin of Tradition in the centre of Eurasian heartland, and its subsequent diffusion throughout the rest of the world. Dugin claims that "excavations in Eastern Siberia and Mongolia prove that exactly here were the most ancient centres of civilization." Finally, in an added postmodern touch, the symbol of Eurasianism is also a symbol of chaos invented by the British science fiction and fantasy author Michael Moorcock in his 1970 novel "The Eternal Champion". This is presumably an allusion to Dugin's "chaotic logos", and perhaps also to "right-wing anarchism" and its conception of sovereignty.

Each ethnos is a "logos". As Heidegger famously noted, the Greek word logos (speech) is related to the verb legein, an agrarian term signifying "gathering", "harvesting" (the ethnos, remember, is a hunter-gatherer or archaic agrarian society). The logos gathers together everything that has been made distinct by being named, including the dead and the gods, into a single space or "place" (Ort). In this sense, language is the "house of Being". It is an ordering of space and time, inscribing the landscape and the cycle of the seasons into itself by means of a calendar, a map and a taxonomy. Space, time, man, and nature are gathered together in a single, permanent, identical figure: a world. Dugin identifies this figure with the ethnos, which strives to conserve and reproduce itself as a world, but not as a biological entity (although he does not make it clear why biological conservation of the race is not a necessary part of the conservation of the world of the ethnos). He also identifies the ethnos with a specific language.

Since each ethnos is a "logos" - in the sense of a structure of language, of thought, and of social relations - this becomes the basis for a kind of cultural and linguistic relativism. There is not just the one, universal Reason of the western Enlightenment. There are many different valid "rationalities" (although "reason", "rationality" and "logic" are already deviations from the original meaning of "logos"). The fourth political theory rejects the "epistemological hegemony" of the West. Dugin argues, for example, that sub-

Saharan Africans must not be deemed inferior because they do not live up to the norms and standards of the modern West. The Western conceptions of Reason, enlightenment and “emancipation” are not the universal goal “humanity” is consciously or unconsciously striving towards, with ethnic and cultural differences viewed as mere particularistic obstacles to be overcome on the way. The dominance of the Western form of rationality tends to exclude all other forms of rationality and deny them legitimacy. Dugin, like other postmodernists, wants to relativise the Western logos as only one of many possible logoi, without any legitimate claim to a privileged status. The relationship between these logoi is non-hierarchical, anarchic and pluralistic. Insofar as a subject is a kind of rationality, there are many different types of subjects - not just the modern, Western, enlightened version of humanity, defined by Western rationality. In other words, Dugin reiterates the postmodern critiques of Western culture, all of which are familiar and nauseating to anyone who has attended a Western university. The global political hegemony of the West is founded on the hegemony of Western reason. Western rationality (technological rationality) not only allowed western man to subjugate his natural environment, it allowed the West to subjugate the rest of the world. It forced other peoples to choose between adopting the Western model themselves, or remaining colonial subjects of the West.

According to the ideology of the Enlightenment, reason is universal, and is the defining characteristic of universal human nature, of man as animal rationale. Reason is what all human beings have in common, a common norm on the basis of which conflicts can be neutralised and mediated, and the world ultimately harmonised. This is the telos – the goal and end-point – of history, and the path towards it is progressive, universal enlightenment. When this goal and ideal end-point is reached, conflict, and hence politics in any real sense, will cease to exist. But some critics of the enlightenment have argued that reason cannot neutralise the struggle for power and the conflictual dimension of reality, and that reason is itself an instrument of power and domination. The only authentic freedom is an essentially political freedom that contains within itself the possibility of conflict - conflict that cannot be neutralised by any common norm or foundation in universal reason.

The focus, then, is not on universal reason gradually overcoming the dark demons and phantoms of myth and irrationality, and in the process, uniting humanity, but on the specific world of each ethnos, which is prior to the separation between reason and intuition, logos and myth. Each ethnos identifies itself with the world (the cosmos), or at least sees itself as the centre of the world, insofar as it believes itself to be dwelling in the proximity of the “sacred centre”. The ethnos is a society rooted in a mythical space-time, a sacred geography. The ethnos not only dwells within a space, it is itself a living space, but not in Haushofer’s sense of “Lebensraum”. It is “a space that lives”.

The sacred in itself is an abyss, a chaos. Outside of the cosmos of the ethnos, there is only a terrifying chaos, an abyss of nothingness, the residue of creation. It cannot be eliminated, only held at bay and circumscribed by a boundary. Chaos cannot manifest itself directly. It can only show itself by concealing

itself, by taking on a paradoxical figure of form: by masking itself as a "nothingness that is". It seizes or takes possession of an individual, who then becomes its vessel and personification (as in the case of shamanic possession, or the totemic figure representing the tribe's founder). There, the nameless forces of the outside are socialised and can address the community, taking on the personae (the "masks") of demons, spirits or gods. Through this personification, the sacred becomes a "subject" that can engage in symbolic exchange with the community. The shaman or healer is the central figure of tribal or "ethnic" society, who communicates and mediates between the ethnos and the beyond - the sacred realm of the dead, demons or gods. The shaman is both a liminal and a "conservative" figure, a guardian who works to conserve the cosmic order, waging war on demons and malignant spirits of the chaotic outside. His or her work consists in dealing with the various crises that the ethnos and its members periodically go through. The shaman not only heals individuals in the tribe, but above all heals the tribe itself and the cosmos, making them whole, restoring the cosmic order founded on the sacred. He or she is able to pass from one ontological plane to another by climbing the axis mundi, the sacred pillar, mountain or world-tree.

Eliade believed that shamanism originated in Eurasia. It was a pre-historic vehicle through which elements of the primordial tradition were transmitted to pre-Columbian America and other areas. Eliade views the shaman as a kind of proto-sovereign, in the sense that he is able to magically bind and unbind. He occupies a "liminal" position - managing crises within the normal order of the tribe and cosmos, but doing so only insofar as he communicates with the dangerous, chaotic outside. He possesses traits similar to those that according to Carl Schmitt define sovereignty - the power to suspend the normative order, not in order to destroy it, but in order to save it from dissolution and chaos.

The shaman enacts the primordial, permanent struggle or strife, the activity and dynamism that underlies the static structure of the ethnos.

The dynamic of the ethnos is opposed to the new. It views all change as a crisis, as entropy, eroding the stability of the cosmos. The ethnos is inherently conservative and anti-historical, in the sense that its sole purpose is to maintain homeostasis, to work to maintain its identity with itself. Its main concern is self-reproduction. Again, this is not in the sense of the biological preservation and self-reproduction of the race. In reproducing itself, the ethnos ritually restores and maintains the order and equilibrium of the cosmos and the flow of its circular economy. Its existence is centred in the cycle of the seasons, of seeding and harvesting, child-birth and death. The time of the ethnos, then, is not linear and irreversible (historical), but recurrent, circular and reversible. Using Armin Mohler's terminology, we could also call the time-space of the ethnos a "sphere" ("Kugel"). It is a wholeness that has not yet been split into the dualisms of time and eternity, matter and spirit, man and nature, individual and society, etc. The individual is not seen as separate from the ethnos, and the ethnos is identified with the world. This

world transcends and outlives the individual. The primary care of the individual is not self-preservation, but the preservation of the ethnos/world.

Since the time of the ethnos is the eternal return of the same, death itself is not an irreversible event. The souls of the ancestors return in their descendants. The individual as an historically unique, mortal being does not exist. Children are potentially destabilising, alien elements that threaten the cohesiveness of the tribe, but are assimilated through initiation. When they are initiated into adulthood, they become reincarnations or personifications of their ancestors. (Prior to initiation, children are viewed as both dangerous and sacred by many primitive tribal groups.) Individuality has no positive meaning for the ethnos. In this sense, the ethnos is the reverse of modern society, in which the individual defines itself in opposition to the community. Instead of the individual, it is the ethnos as a whole that is the normative unit, "the man". In other words, it could be viewed as a kind of "subject".

At this point, however, it becomes unclear how this can have anything to do with Dasein, since Dasein is defined precisely by its historicity, finitude and mortality. For Heidegger, men are, in their deepest and most fundamental essence, mortals. Dasein's mortality is not the consequence of modern Western man's loss of faith or nihilism. In a sense, the essence of man - Dasein - is finitude, and finitude is not simply a human characteristic, but part of the essence of Being itself. Dasein, as finitude, belongs to the structure of Being itself, so that the question of Dasein is a necessary step in approaching the question of Being. Heidegger elaborates his concept of Dasein not as a philosophical anthropology, but as a part of his ontological project. Dugin talks about Dasein, but detaches the term from the question of Being. In doing this, Dugin effectively empties the term of meaning. Nowhere does he show that he actually understands what Heidegger means by "Dasein", or what is at stake in Being and Time.

The forgetting of Being is not a human error - and much less the error only of Western humanity - but part of the essence of Being itself. The essence of nihilism is not a human error or something created by human beings at all. Moreover, only the complete nihilism that coincides with the end of Western metaphysics and the planetary dominion of modern technology opens up the possibility of the question of Being in Heidegger's sense. Contrary to what traditionalists believe, nihilism cannot be overcome through a return to metaphysics, since nihilism is itself the final actualisation of metaphysics. The essence of metaphysics is the movement of transcendence (*Übersteigen*). The history of metaphysics is the event of transcendence, the transcendence of beings by Being. It is in this sense that Heidegger defines metaphysics as "the history of Being". All metaphysical concepts are structured by the fundamental ontological difference between Being and beings, i. e., the transcendence of beings by Being, through which beings are gathered, grounded and held in suspense by the withdrawal of Being.

The historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) of Dasein is founded on the irreversible and unrepeatable event (Geschehnis) that Dasein itself is. Dasein is not only mortal, but also "natal" (gebürtig). Natality is the essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit). Birth is an "event" (Geschehnis) in the sense that ontologically, it is an absolute beginning, an absolute interruption or break with the past (even though ontically, it is of course a natural event, part of a continuous chain of causes and effects). Man has a history because man as Dasein is himself history.

Death, for Heidegger, is not simply a natural event, a consequence of the fact that our bodies are part of the natural world and conditioned by its cycles of growth and decline. On the contrary, man's mortality separates him (as Dasein) from the natural realm. It has the power to violently tear Dasein out of the automatisms of inauthentic social relations, the commerce of everyday life and the impostures of false subjectivity. Heidegger calls this sleep-walking, inauthentic existence "das Man". Das Man is not responsible for its existence. Instead, it observes existence from the outside, like a kind of spectacle. Mortality is never "addressed to" das Man, but always concerns someone else. In a sense, "the subject" - abstract humanity - is das Man - a free-floating ego detached from concrete, historical, finite existence. The traumatic truth of being-towards-death, the crisis of existential anxiety, isolates Dasein and liberates it at the same time, but not in the sense in which the "subject" is free because it floats in an unconditioned, transcendent realm somewhere outside or beyond the objective world.

Finitude is for Heidegger not just a naturally given limit to freedom, power and life. The limits that isolate and liberate Dasein are not simply negative or privative, but positive and active - active in the sense of a power of overcoming. The limit transcends or overcomes what it limits. Dasein's "transcendence" is being-towards-death, not the transcendence of a subject suspended above concrete existence. The individuality of authentic Dasein is not the basis of the arbitrary freedom of irresponsible, hedonistic egoism. The finitude of Dasein is given meaning only as an historical responsibility. The authentic freedom of Dasein is not an unconditioned freedom from time and history, but is the essence of historicity (Geschichtlichkeit) itself as an event (Geschehnis). Through historical existence, Dasein's finitude becomes the source of a potential renewal and re-founding of the historical community it is born into. Insofar as Dasein's limit is active, it is a decision, and Dasein is summoned to affirm, take responsibility for and ground that decision in its projected being-as-a-whole.

Heidegger would view the historicity of primitive, tribal Dasein as only existing as something undeveloped or pre-conscious. Only Western man has a deeper experience of the fundamentally historical essence of Dasein as an event (Geschehnis), which corresponds to Being as an event (Ereignis). However, this experience has remained unthought and philosophically unelaborated, because thinking has remained trapped by the categories of metaphysics, subjectivism and Christian humanism. Dugin, however, attempts to relativise Heidegger's notion of Dasein, claiming that it only applies to Western Europeans. In doing so, however, Dugin shows himself to be more a postmodern relativist than a

Heideggerian. By giving complete ontological priority to language, he renders the concept of Dasein effectively meaningless. For Heidegger, man does not exist as Dasein because he has a language, but has a language because he exists as Dasein. In other words, Dasein as an event (Geschehnis) is ontologically prior to language and social life. It follows that the existential structure of Dasein cannot itself be determined by the structure of language and society. Heidegger's position is in a sense absolutely opposed to that of social constructivism, which is merely a form of subjectivism, making reality - including man himself - entirely a creation of man. It goes without saying that it is also opposed to Marxism, which interprets humanity's emancipation as humanity's self-production.

Since the ethnos, according to Dugin, does not know irreversible, historical time - only cyclical time, the eternal return of the same - it is inherently opposed not only to everything new, but to all forms of accumulation. The ethnos ritually destroys (sacrifices) accumulated resources that could endanger its homeostasis and symbolic equilibrium. Not only a deficit, but an excess of production is viewed as dangerous and problematic. In this sense, its economy is anti-capitalist. It constantly interrupts the linear time of accumulation. Accumulation is viewed as guilt, as a debt to the gods that must be repaid. To sacrifice something - to destroy an accumulated excess - means to give it to the gods. The ethnos strives to conserve a social and cosmic equilibrium, as well as an equilibrium between society and nature. Society is naturalised and nature is socialised. Together, they form a sacred whole, a circular economy.

The ethnos, then, is a form of primordial, pre-historic communism in which work is play and man lives in perfect accord with his natural environment. It is an ecologically sound, harmonious cosmic and social totality, a golden age before man's fall into history, a paradise in which the entropic, destructive force of time is defeated, or at least held in check. The ethnos does not know the tension of social stratification, and there is no division of labour, except between the genders. The relationship between the genders, however, is also balanced and non-patriarchal. The space-time of the ethnos, as we noted earlier, is reversible, and this goes for its social relations, too. There are no asymmetrical, hierarchical relationships within society, only a balance maintained through symbolic exchange. In other words, the ethnos is a democratic and egalitarian society (at least on a symbolic level). As an embodiment the golden age, it represents the primordial perfection of man. The man of the ethnos, in other words, is a sort of noble savage (a modern concept if there ever was one!) that can be opposed to the evils of Western society since the scientific revolution.

The restoration of this primordial unity, bringing linear history and capitalist accumulation to an end in a revolutionary holocaust, is according to Dugin the unconscious mythical and eschatological dimension of communism. The revolution abolishes linear time, which is identified with entropy and usury. Dugin apparently thinks that the violence of communist revolutions should be interpreted as a kind of

sacrificial destruction of accumulated wealth. Capitalist accumulation is an excess that must be sacrificially destroyed through the liquidation of the bourgeoisie as a class.

The modern age is the age of revolutions, but as Jünger observed, the violence of revolutions - including the Terror of the French revolution - could be interpreted as a return of repressed elemental forces under the mask of enlightened modernity. Just as gods, spirits and demons communicate with the tribe by personifying themselves in the shaman, elemental chaos shows itself under the mask, the "persona" of the modern, supposedly rational, revolutionary subject. This is why for Dugin, the only real problem with communism was that it failed to understand itself. Its self-interpretation, its "hermeneutic circle" must be shattered. Communism made a mistake regarding the political subject. It saw class, rather than the archaic ethnos, as its subject. It wore the mask of a modern, progressive, secular ideology. This is why Marxists could not understand why communist revolutions took place in undeveloped, agrarian societies, and not, as Marx had predicted, in industrially developed societies like Germany.

Authentic communism, Dugin argues, is "national communism" (represented by Stalin, for example) or agrarian communism (represented by Pol Pot). "National communism" (or "national gauchism", as Dugin also calls it) is interpreted as a revolt against the Western, modern world, a revolt rooted in local, ethnic traditions. National communism is a hybrid of the Western rationality of Marxism and the mobilising force of non-Western ethnic myths. Dugin points to the "National Communist character of successful Marxist revolutions, recognising nationalistic elements as a driving factor and virtue, providing these revolutions with success and stability via archaic national stories of the mobilisation of Marxism as nationally interpreted eschatological myth" ["The Fourth Political Theory", p. 128]. "National Communism", Dugin tells us, "ruled in the USSR, Communist China, North Korea, Vietnam, Albania, Cambodia, and also in many Communist movements of the Third World, from the Mexican Chiapas and Peruvian Sendero Luminoso to the Kurdish Workers' Party and Islamic socialism [128]. In national communism/gauchism, Marxism functions as a universal philosophical framework that allows national movements - local by their nature - to communicate with each other and "even claim universality and planetary breadth; transforming, thanks to socialist rationality warmed up by nationalism, into a messianic project [130]." In his opinion, "National Gauchism could certainly have a global future, insofar as among many segments of humanity archaic, ethnic and religious energies are far from being spent, whatever can be said of the citizens of the modern, enlightened and rational West" [131]. Dugin evidently follows the old leftist, anti-colonialist topos of the third world and non-whites as the only remaining revolutionary subjects (third world nationalism, unlike European nationalism, was glorified by the left as a revolt against Western imperialism). In reality, mass non-white immigration to the West, attracted by its earthly "paradise" or "golden age" of material wealth, religious tolerance, modernity and generous welfare systems, has long since made it obvious that non-white peoples are not the subjects of national communist revolutions, but simply one of the instruments of the globalist, ethnocidal anthropological revolution.

Dugin appears to equate the white West with the bourgeoisie, and non-white peoples (or Russians insofar as they are "not fully white") with the revolutionary subject. He believes that the first successful communist revolution took place in Russia because the "ethnos" had retained more of its primitive vitality there than in the modern West (remember, Dugin views Russians as non-white). His concept of the ethnos allows him to interpret Russia's backwardness as a positive trait, rather than as a source of shame, in the same way that the negative view of the West found in traditionalist writings allows muslims to view their societies as spiritually superior to the decadent, anti-traditional, secular West, while at the same time apparently not feeling the least compunction over living as parasites on the productive labour of Western societies. It becomes embarrassingly obvious that one is dealing with an overcompensation for what is really a collective inferiority complex. Russia's backwardness is interpreted as the proof that it has successfully warded off infection by the "evils" of Western modernity. The communist revolution was in its essence a revolt of the Eurasian Russian ethnos against Western-oriented elites. Bolshevism was a re-Asianisation of Russia. Rather than taking the modern West as a norm, which can only lead to devaluing the history of Russia and other non-Western nations as marginal and backward, Dugin wants to reverse the relationship, restoring Eurasia to the dignity of the "sacred centre" and marginalising the West as its "profane periphery". Dugin assigns a central, Messianic role to Russia analogous to the Messianic role the German conservative revolutionaries assigned to Germany as the sacred centre or axis of Europe. Eurasia is not only a locus of the great geopolitical decisions of our time, it is a sacred centre also in the sense of a crossing, a crucial point, an intersection and mediator between East and West, Europe and Asia. A similar role is assigned to Iran, Hungary and Turkey as Eurasian mediators between the East and Europe. Eurasianists declare themselves to be close to the leftist Turkish Workers' Party, and Turkey is viewed by Eurasianists as part of Europe for purely geopolitical reasons. The massive occupation of German territory by Turkish immigrants, they argue, will be a positive factor in favouring the integration of Turkey and Germany into a common Eurasian empire. Here, as always for the Eurasianists, geographical and geopolitical considerations take complete precedence over racial factors, to the point of completely denying the latter. We see the implications of Dugin's conception of the ethnos as constituted not by race or by history, but by a space. Here, for some reason, Dugin is suddenly no longer a social constructivist. Geopolitical determinism is substituted for racial or historical materialist determinism. Geopolitical factors are seen as being more decisive than both racial and economic factors. Racial nationalism is rejected as either "utopian" or "reactionary". The issue of race is not viewed as being of critical, decisive importance - what is decisive for the Eurasianists - what determines the distinction between friend and enemy - is the fight against the West.

This complete precedence given to soil at the expense of blood makes the relevance of Eurasianism for European nationalists today - for whom immigration is the existentially decisive question - very dubious. The massive occupation of European soil by African and Middle Eastern immigrants does not make them Europeans, and never will. This is not just because they lack a deep relationship to European soil and traditions, but also because they are racially alien. Blacks and arabs in Europe may be

“westernised”, but that only means globalised, that is, Americanised. Homo Americanus is the normative “human” type of the post-modern age.

Dugin tries to interpret Marxism’s profane, linear vision of history in terms of cyclical, mythic time, making the communist political revolution into a cyclical cosmic revolution, a return to a utopian golden age. Just as he tries to translate historical time into mythical time, he tries to translate geopolitical space into sacred geography. He wants us to see the West as the absolutely negative pole, and the East as the absolutely positive pole. In the Manichean and tiresomely propagandistic narrative of the Eurasianists, the East is paradise (Eden) and the West is hell. “Sacred geography on the basis of ‘space symbolism’ traditionally considers the East as ‘the land of Spirit’, the paradise land, the land of a completeness, abundance, the Sacred ‘native land’ in its fullest and most perfect kind. [...] The West has the opposite symbolical meaning. It is the ‘country of death’, the ‘lifeless world’ [...]. West is ‘the empire of exile’, ‘the pit of the rejected’, according to the expression of Islamic mystics. West is “anti-east”, the country of [...] decay, degradation, transition from the manifest to the non-manifest, from life to death, from completeness to need, etc.” Moreover, “[a]long the East-West axis were drawn peoples and civilizations, possessing hierarchical characters — closer to the East were those closer to Sacral, to Tradition, to spiritual wealth. Closer to West, those of a more decayed, degraded and dying Spirit”.

“[S]acred geography univocally affirms the law of ‘qualitative space’, in which the East represents the symbolic ‘ontological plus’, and the West the ‘ontological minus’. According to the Chinese tradition, the East is Yang, the male, bright, solar principle, and the West is Yin, the female, dark, lunar principle.” “Geopolitical East represents in itself the straight opposition to geopolitical West. [...] Instead of ‘democracy’ and ‘human right’ the East gravitates around totalitarianism, socialism and authoritarianism, i.e. around various types of social regimes, whose only common feature is that the centre of their systems there is not the ‘individual’, ‘man’ with his ‘rights’ and his peculiar ‘individual values’, but something supra-individual, supra-human — be it ‘society’, ‘nation’, ‘people’, ‘idea’, ‘weltanschauung’, ‘religion’, ‘cult of the leader’ etc. The East opposed to western liberal democracy the most various types of non-liberal, non-individualistic the societies — from authoritarian monarchy up to theocracy or socialism. Moreover, from a pure typological, geopolitical point of view, the political specificity of this or that regime was secondary in comparison with the qualitative dividing between ‘western’ (= ‘individualist - mercantile’) order and ‘eastern’ (= ‘supra-individualist – based on force’) order. Representative forms of such anti-western civilization were the USSR, communist China, Japan about 1945 or Khomeini’s Iran” [“From Sacred Geography to Geopolitics”].

Here, Dugin deviates completely from traditionalism in confusing brute material force with true authority, and interpreting communist forms of totalitarianism and collectivism, as well as the unstratified, non-hierarchical collectivism of primitive societies, as “supra-individual” and transcendent.

Evola, who never advocated totalitarianism, regarded them both as the opposite of supra-individual and transcendent - as sub-individual and undifferentiated.

Ernst Jünger, in his National Bolshevik period, not only rejected bourgeois individualism, but also its flip side, the collectivism of the masses. Instead, he believed that both bourgeois individualism and the formlessness of the masses would be overcome by the emergence of a new "type" of man, which he called "the Worker", that will be capable of mastering the forces mobilised by modern technology. But Dugin simply adopts, reversing it, Popper's liberal reduction of fascism and communism to the single term "totalitarianism", reducing radically heterogeneous movements to the same, simply because they reject liberalism. In this sense, he actually interprets fascism not so much from the point of view of the left, as from the point of view of liberalism.

The ethnos, then, is not what traditionalists like Evola call a traditional society. Moreover, given that the ethnos is in its essence ahistorical and lacks a relation to the other, Dugin has not sufficiently clarified how it can be a political and historical subject. It is also unclear how Dugin proposes to unite Heidegger's concept of Dasein as historicity with the anti-historical position of traditionalism. He has, however, proposed another possible political and historical subject: civilisation. This will be the topic of the next installment of this essay.

Race, "Ethnos" and "The Fourth Political Theory"

by Bruno Cariou, from Elements of Racial Education

Each camp has spies in the other camps, in particular in time of war and, always in time of war, the men, in each camp, tend, by opportunism, to caress the authorities in the direction of the hair, to adhere sentimentally. to the ideology and propaganda of the regime, as long as all is well, for, when the going gets tough, to turn over their jacket, or at least, all not being able to deny the ideas which they do not have, to make the eyes soft at the enemy camp and, to use a typically biblical expression, to sell him his birthright for a plate of lentils, as soon as the tide turns, that the victory changes sides. With their country invaded, occupied, legitimately or not, for its own good or not, the opportunists immediately collaborate with the invader, no matter who the invader is, whether the invader occupies another's territory legitimately or not. for the good of others or not. Their country invaded, their country occupied by frogs, the opportunists would swear allegiance to the frogs. Their country invaded, their country occupied by vacuum cleaners, the opportunists would swear allegiance to the vacuum cleaners. As soon as his country was, rightly or not, liberated and occupied by the opposing camp, the opportunist joined the opposing camp, waiting to pursue his career with impunity under the occupier, a career which, provided that the The occupier judges that, of all the viziers he has at his disposal, he is the most qualified to take the measures necessary for the definitive enslavement of the country, can lead him under the paneling of the Republic. Inevitably, he gets caught up in his past, preferably in the paneled twilight of his life. In most cases, the past in question is fascist; It is extremely rare for an opportunist to get caught up in a communist past, but it is extremely common for an opportunist journalist to pin an opportunist politician for his fascist past and for the opportunist journalist to argue from that past to conclude that the opportunist politician does not he has never ceased to be fascist and, generalizing, that fascism, under the guise of democracy, is still in power. For example, Liberation reveals in 1995 that Bernhard de Lippe-Biesterfeld, prince consort of the Netherlands from 1950 to 1980, was a member of the NSDAP from 1933 to 1936 and, as, on the other hand, it is revealed in the process that Bernhard de Lippe-Biesterfeld was chairman of the board of the Bilderberg club, one of the flagships of globalism, from 1954 to 1975, all the budding Sherlock Holmes on the planet deduce from this that the Bildeberg club can only be a benchmark of " Fascists ", of " Nazis " (a few films on the subject have already left Hollywood studios). The NSDAP was not infiltrated by stateless high finance agents, none of those who resisted in the Third Reich were among the 5.5 people included in the NSDAP in 1936, the administration and diplomacy under National Socialism were not riddled with traitors and allied spies (*). "Nazism" is still alive and well; the Fascists are in power incognito, as proven by the nationalist and racist policies of the governments which have been at the head of European countries since the end of the Second World War: national interests have never been so safeguarded there, national values too exalted, to say nothing of racial laws and anti-immigration laws, each equally drastic.

The reductio ad hitlerum is one of the main characteristics of all the mediatized bedridden forms of "conspiracy theory", of which one should not think that all the senile tenors are schizophrenics - although only a true schizophrenic is able to make a schizophrenic public. , if this audience is not already

and, in this case, to aggravate his schizophrenia. Conspiracy theory is one of the preferred mediums of globalist propaganda. In power, the pseudo-globalist elites advertise globalism, in the same way that in power nationalists would advertise nationalism. There is nothing very natural about this. What is less is to present oneself as an opponent of globalism, while making, in one form or another, propaganda for the values, at least for certain values, of globalism. This is the case with all current media or media anti-globalists whom extremists can easily label as "far right". The incoherence of their positions is explained by the fact that they are either former Marxists or religious. What the media qualify as "extreme right" no longer exists since the end of World War II, from which, in any case, all organized political groups, from parties to small groups, have been more or less infiltrated. by the winners (**). At the same time, the entryism of the Marxists into the world of Right-wing intellectuals was such that they replaced the right-wing thinkers worthy of the name who were part of it and that it is their hybrid thought that they are trying today. to pass off as Right-wing principles, often successfully, their public falling on the whole, for lack of critical and discriminating power, no doubt also for lack of "race", under the spell of their "dialectic", including a a minimum of discernment is enough, however, to identify the suiffeux sophisms, the gross confusions, the wobbly paradoxes, the mechanical subtleties; everything and its opposite can be said in the same text, or even in the same sentence.

We present below what constitutes to our knowledge the first substantial and detailed critical analysis of the thought of one of these "old" Marxists (***).

3346/5000

Alexandre Dugin designated liberalism as the enemy of the "fourth political theory", or rather, since the enemy can only be a current group of people and not an idea or an ideology, he designated as enemies all those who are in favor of the world hegemony of liberalism (ie the hegemony of the "West"). "If you are in favor of liberal world hegemony, you are the enemy" is one of its slogans.

What does Dugin mean by "liberalism"? By "liberalism" he does not mean the ideology of those Americans call "liberals." The term "liberal" does not have the same meaning in Europe and the United States. The "Liberals" in the United States are on the left: they vote for the Democratic Party and are in favor of a welfare state and a regulated economy. In Europe, they would be considered social democrats. Ideologically, they are egalitarian and tend to criticize savage capitalism. They oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from an egalitarian perspective. They view prison sentences as a method of therapy and socialization rather than a form of punishment. They believe in "social justice" rather than punitive justice. They believe that human beings are fundamentally good and can be saved through "social work". They believe in social conditioning rather than personal responsibility. They believe that human beings can be saved in this world. They tend to favor a strict separation of church and state, while advocating an egalitarian worldview that is essentially a form of secularized Christianity.

In Europe, the "liberals" are on the right: generally opposed to the welfare state, they are in favor of the market economy, the privatization of infrastructure and an unregulated economy. Traditionally, they also support various conservative social policies, with an emphasis on individual responsibility as a

corollary of the notion of individual rights. In other words, liberalism is a bourgeois ideology, favorable to a capitalist economy, based on the Enlightenment ideology of individual rights. Today, however, the opposition between left and right is less and less clear and is gradually being replaced by consensus. The social policies of European liberal parties often coincide with those associated with the post-Sixty-Eight libertarian left. Liberal, pro-capitalist parties oppose "racism", "sexism" and "homophobia" from the standpoint of individualist libertarianism. They oppose the categorization of human beings. Everyone should be treated as a person, in an impartial manner. Ideas of national, religious or sexual identity are a thing of the past. National borders and ethnic communities, insofar as they limit the freedom of the individual, must be abolished. The freedom of the individual must be defended, as long as this does not interfere with the rights of other individuals. This is the liberalism that Dugin called the enemy: globalist capitalism based on the ideology of human rights.

Today, it is increasingly evident that the egalitarian social democratic left and the bourgeois liberal right both have their roots and foundations in human rights ideology. All the institutional parties of left and right today tend to favor multiculturalism, immigration, gay rights and separation of church and state. Overall, they are all in favor of gender equality and, at times, liberalization of drugs. The "right" justifies these policies by individual rights and the "left" by egalitarianism. In addition, the leftist middle-class "revolutionaries" of the late 1960s and early 1970s often shifted from the communist left to the liberal right, after realizing that their membership of the left was based on an ideological misunderstanding. They were essentially libertarian bourgeois who thought they were communists.

The difference between the "left" and the "right" today in Europe lies in the interpretation of one and the same fundamental anthropological and ideological heritage, that of the Enlightenment. It would be more accurate to speak of "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" rather than simply "liberal hegemony". Liberalism and egalitarianism are based on the ideology of human rights, but emphasize different aspects of them. Right-wing liberals insist on the individual aspect of human rights. Left-wing egalitarians insist on the universal aspect of human rights. These two conceptions of humanity - the universal man and the individual man - are abstractions: defined only in a negative way, they both embody abstract freedom. The universal man and the individual man are defined as not belonging to a group or category (ethnic or otherwise). Since man is universal, "he" cannot be defined by, or limited to, any particular ethnicity, gender, or other particular category. On the other hand, the individual cannot as such be included in a category or defined as belonging to a collectivity (national ethnicity, sex, etc.), as this would violate his individuality. The individual is therefore every human being; it virtually corresponds to all of humanity. The individual is universal (as a representative of "humanity" as such) and all human beings are, as such, individuals (1). In other words, the "universal man" can only be the "individual man". Egalitarianism and individualism ultimately boil down to the same thing.

It would therefore be more correct to speak of "liberal-egalitarian hegemony" than simply "liberal hegemony". This hegemony is both political and metapolitical. All the major political parties established in Europe today gravitate towards this liberal-egalitarian center. Some groups find themselves marginalized. As the center is the bourgeois, rational, human individual, the exclusive heir to the Enlightenment, posing reason as the characteristic trait of humanity, those who in one way or another deviate from the center are at various seen as less than human, irrational and unenlightened. The

marginalized are seen as irrational, "crazy" and "extremist". They are de-humanized, silenced and excluded from the political sphere. These groups include all those outside of liberal modernity, such as religious conservatives (mostly Christians and Muslims), who oppose gay rights and the separation of church and state. Christian religious conservatives are not, however, completely marginalized - they are still present in established political parties, although their influence is weaker and weaker. Another marginalized group is the Communists, who oppose the concept of individual rights, free enterprise and private property. However, they too are not completely marginalized, especially in universities and cultural institutions. When the need arises, they are allowed to enter coalition governments. They also have a common basis with institutional political parties through the egalitarian universalist aspects of their ideology, which has its roots in the Enlightenment. Much more marginalized and demonized are the nationalists, who oppose, to varying degrees, universalism (to the extent that they oppose immigration), to free trade (to the extent that they want to protect national economies) and individualism (to the extent that they consider national and ethnic identity to take precedence over individual identity in some cases). Finally, the most marginalized and "untouchable" group of all are racists and racial nationalists, who oppose not only universalism but also egalitarianism. However heterogeneous these groups may be, they are often lumped together by the liberal center.

Alain de Benoist, Dugin and Alain Soral want to create an "alliance of the periphery against the center", that is to say more or less marginalized groups against the political establishment. In practice, this therefore means not so much an alliance between the radical left and the radical right as an alliance between religious conservatives (mainly Muslim and Orthodox) and the former communists (2). A good example in Western Europe is Alain Soral and his Equality and Reconciliation, which seeks to found an alliance between Muslim immigrants and French patriots. The name of Soral's movement already indicates that criticism of egalitarianism is not on the agenda. Racism or racial nationalism either. Dugin too avoids any criticism of egalitarianism, downplaying the real differences between left and right in order to focus entirely on attacking "liberalism" (3). The notion of "liberalism" - intentionally ambiguous for him, this term sometimes refers to capitalist economic individualism, sometimes to the moral individualism of homosexual rights activists and that of the laity - plays the role of a central pole. opposition which is supposed to artificially unify into a single (purely utopian) group groups which are otherwise deeply heterogeneous.

Dugin who calls for a "crusade against the West" does not oppose liberalism as it is at the origin of the destruction of the white race. On the contrary, he often seems to identify liberalism with the destruction of the white race. Its primary stated goal is to destroy liberalism, even if that must mean burying the white race with liberalism. As he puts it in *The Fourth Political Theory*, "liberalism (and post-liberalism) can (and must) be rejected. And if, behind it, stands the full power of the inertia of modernity, the spirit of the Enlightenment and the logic of the political and economic history of the European world of the last centuries, it must be rejected at the same time. as modernity, the Enlightenment and the European world. Moreover, only the recognition of liberalism understood as a destiny, as a fundamental influence, the very march of the history of Western Europe, will allow us to really say "no" to liberalism (4). He also defines the race which is the subject of the *Fourth Political Theory* as a "non-white European" race (5). He predicted anti-white pogroms on a global scale as retribution for white race wrongdoing, pogroms

that will not target the Russians, however, because they are not, he says [http://www.arcto.ru/article/1289], completely white.

In other words, Dugin is not a white nationalist. Dugin said he views race as a social construct (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7X-ondhSVA>). This statement may seem ridiculous to us, but everything suggests that it is rather sincere. It fits with its postmodern and relativistic theoretical orientation as well as with its previous statements about the unrealistic and potentially dangerous nature of the idea of white solidarity:

"When it comes to the myth of 'the solidarity of the white race', it is a complete utopia that not only leads to the Holocaust of the Jews, but also to the genocide of the Slavs. The remains of the Third Reich are the basis of this miserable, contradictory and utterly false conception. The Anglo-Saxon world is a socio-political and cultural reality. The people of central Europe are something different. The eastern world of Orthodox and Slavic Christianity is a third reality. I am sure that many non-white peoples of Eurasia are a thousand times closer to us in spirit and culture than Americans." (6). In short, Dugin is of the view - like many Jews - that any form of positive racial identity among whites will inevitably and fatally lead to "a new holocaust."

Presumably, Dugin, following in the footsteps of Alain de Benoist, sees the concept of race - and the phenomenon of racism - as a product of the Enlightenment, a modern phenomenon, and for Dugin "modern" always means "bad." It is correct that the concept of race was formulated in the context of the Enlightenment. But that in itself is not a sufficient reason to reject the notion of race. Race was a biological fact even before the concept of race was developed, just as DNA existed before it was discovered by scientists. A follower of social and linguistic constructivism, Dugin may dispute the idea that race exists in the absence of a concept of race. Philosophically, Dugin believes that nothing exists outside of language and social relations. Relativism, which is the hallmark of postmodernism, is, according to Dugin, philosophically compatible with traditionalism, for it asserts that "from the point of view of 'integral tradition' the difference between the 'artificial' and the 'natural' is generally quite relative, since tradition has never known anything like the Cartesian or Kantian dualism of the 'subjective' and the 'objective' (7). Dugin attempts to interpret postmodernity - with his relativist critique of the universalism of Enlightenment reason, in other words of the foundation of the project of modernity - as a phenomenon that paves the way for a resurgence of pre-thought patterns. -modern and traditional pre-rationalists. Dugin's relativistic approach is an integral part of the entire Fourth Political Theory project, as it is the philosophical basis for the idea of an ethno-pluralist multipolar world.

It may be that Dugin subscribes to the idea that, for the biological notion of race to be meaningful, that is to say for it to be possible to classify such and such individuals as belonging to such and such a race, there must be a racially pure person who could embody a standard of comparison, an ideal standard. Since, genetically, such an individual may not exist, the concept of race is supposedly devoid of scientific basis and turns out to have only social significance.

As Dugin considers race as a construct, he can freely manipulate and extend the concept of "racism" to include different forms of discrimination that this term does not normally cover: cultural, civilizational,

technological, social, economic and even cinematographic and clothing. . The concept of "racism" is broadened and watered down (it becomes synonymous with discrimination on the basis of norms that are subjective or relative), to the point that almost anyone can claim to be the victim. Since he defines racism as "any attempt at subjective assessment of the state of a theory," he can argue that, in addition to National Socialism and Fascism, Communism and Liberalism are racist because they pose a certain political subject as normative (the proletariat or the enlightened bourgeois individual). There are undoubtedly racist elements in Marx's writings. He favored colonialism as a means of modernizing and industrializing non-European nations, which was a necessary prerequisite for the final transition to communism. He was also convinced that certain races were doomed to disappear, because they were inherently incapable of surviving the inevitable historical evolution towards communism.

Dugin also turns anti-racism against modernity and progressivism. It is "racist" [on the part of a white], for example, to pass negative judgment on immigrants from black Africa or the Middle East because they are unable to adapt to technologically modern Western societies. advances. In fact, the traditional Arab and African conceptions of women, homosexuality, child rearing - along with their rejection of evolution and their religious views - are seen by Dugin as a sign of their spiritual superiority (7). Moreover, he sees the very idea of progress as inherently racist, as it implies that modern society (Western society) is normative and superior to traditional non-Western societies. It is not, he says, because they are incapable of building civilizations that these must be regarded as societies frozen in archaic social forms. On the contrary, if they are unable to do so, it is because they are more spiritual and have preserved the tradition better than the white race (8).

From the point of view of [those at the head of] the modern West, all societies inherently aspire to the normative type of modern Western society, but have simply not yet succeeded in achieving it. Rightists see this failure as proof of the racial inferiority of non-Western populations, while leftists explain it as a consequence of colonial exploitation and Western imperialism. They all start from the implicit premise that Western modernity is the most advanced and desirable form of society. It is true that, in Western societies, "modern" is more of a positive term. It is more or less synonymous with dynamic, young, enlightened and "open minded". It is the anthropological norm, in the sense that those who either reject it or do not respect it for one reason or another are considered backward, stupid, infrequent, etc. This is arguably a social - and therefore also a political - disadvantage for conservatives of all types, which they share with non-Western immigrants in Western societies. Dugin concludes that conservatives should ally with immigrants, especially Muslim immigrants, against the white liberal establishment (not the Jewish establishment - Dugin does not believe that the Jews are responsible for Western decadence, he believes that the Western "decadence" is simply the full manifestation of the essence of the West and the perverse nature of the white race).

However, whatever efforts most "progressive" Westerners themselves make to try to get rid of racism, through a mechanism that psychoanalysts call "the return of the repressed" it cleverly returns through the back door, taking new unconscious forms, so that, as Dugin rightly points out, political correctness itself "turns into a totalitarian method of purely racist political exclusions". In addition to white "racists", religious conservatives and nationalist conservatives are subjected - with impunity - to forms of social exclusion, aggression, overt contempt, intimidation, physical and psychological violence which are

clearly a expression of these models of behavior which, in all other contexts, are denounced as "racist". These groups, which are often made up of "outsiders" of white society, the most socially and economically vulnerable groups, including the working class, the unemployed, rural dwellers and retirees, are systematically looked down upon by the establishment. , its journalists and its "intellectuals", who regard them as culturally, morally, intellectually and even biologically deficient ("the little whites", "the consanguines", and so on).

Dugin's mania for speaking out against racism strangely resembles an intentional parody of contemporary political correctness, which sees discriminatory norms everywhere and it is possible that, while accepting the postmodern deconstruction of the notion of race, he intends to do so. transform into a deconstruction of the term "racism" itself, extending its meaning to the point of absurdity, to the point of emptying it of its meaning and turning it against itself. Rather than trying, as most conservatives do, to resist postmodern relativism by upholding certain absolute moral standards, the authority of Western tradition, and universal objective standards of rationality, his strategy seems to be to move beyond the last residues. modern ideological assumptions by pushing them to their extreme postmodern conclusions.

However, in *The Fourth Political Theory*, Dugin condemns racism and especially German National Socialism, not only for epistemological reasons, but also for moral reasons. Dugin's condemnation of the consequences of racism is considered simply axiomatic and is not subject to any philosophical criticism. It is not clear on what moral basis this condemnation of Western racism is compatible with absolute cultural relativism, the refusal from any universal point of view allowing normative judgments (including moral ones) to be made on other cultures. Are slavery and genocide only morally reprehensible when they are the work of modern Westerners and are they not when they are the work of other groups? Dugin seems to think so, as evidenced by the following statement he made on Facebook about the slavery and exploitation (for food!) Of black Africans by other black Africans:

"There are African tribes along the Atlantic coast who raise human slaves to eat them. I find that quite reasonable and fully responsible. If we kill animals with our hands, watch them suffer and die, butcher and dismember them, touch their internal organs - or at least if we imagine these acts every time we eat, we are completely sane and we could. possibly go further and adopt - in wars - the same attitude towards men. In war, taking responsibility for the act of killing is essential. Eating animal food carries a very similar responsibility (9). But animal means sensitive, which implies suffering. Let's do it with all responsibility - eat and fight, in short - responsibility for the murder. Or we abstain. The choice is free. "

We can assume that this is a sincere statement and not just a banal will to "shock the bourgeois". It is entirely in accordance with Dugin's cultural relativism (the affirmation of the need to suspend all normative judgment on other cultures, because there is no universal norm that allows them to be made), but one may wonder how this kind of moral relativism is philosophically compatible with claiming to be Christian. Dugin apparently criticizes bourgeois moral hypocrisy, that is, the refusal to take responsibility for the murder and exploitation that are the conditions of bourgeois society. Dugin continues as follows:

"To kill or not to kill (to eat or not to eat):" Do whatever you want ", but never lie (to come back to the subject of vegetarianism and cannibalism) What is good or bad depends on the set of values accepted in society... we live in one society, others live in other societies. Every society kills, murders and commits acts of violence -... on human beings or animals But some societies recognize this and integrate death, murder and violence into their sacred concepts. Other societies, which do the same or worse hypocritically, deny it, call for non-violence, tolerance and the promotion of peace through war and assassination. So I don't judge violence per se, which depends on culture - some cultures sanctify it, others not - but every human group commits the same acts - kills, tortures and eats. I have therefore only emphasized the fact that the peoples who do so are consciously more civilized and cultured, more honest and spiritually developed, less infantile and more mature than those who commit the same act without realizing it or without denying its cannibalistic nature (10). Killing (and eating) is what the world - God - man - the beast rests on. This is the meaning of the priesthood. The priest is the primary killer. Existence is painful. We have to accept it as it is. We cause the pain, we feel the pain. This is a completely normal situation. Cannibalism is not "a disgusting exception" nor "a horrific sign of moral depravity". In a way, it's natural. Indian tradition states that the kshatriya eat the Vaishya (11). The Vedic hymns are full of metaphors (12) which denote the act of eating (killing, devouring). I'm just trying to point out that we are responsible for what we eat, what we kill and destroy. The African and Oceanian tribes give us an example that I find beautiful and pure ". (13).

Given that he accepts moral relativism, it is not very clear how Dugin can condemn at the same time the extermination and the enslavement of Slavs or Jews by National Socialism, nor, for that matter, slavery. and the genocide of other populations by European settlers - practices which, historically, are not unique to Western Europeans (cf., for example, the Old Testament). What universal moral standard does it refer to? The ideology of universal human rights? Probably not. Christian morals, which he refuses to apply to West African cannibals and slave traders? It is difficult to determine how he can accuse the racists of incoherence, since all combative supporters of racial supremacy make no secret of their intentions. Finally, it is not clear how Dugin can without hypocrisy condemn National Socialism from a moral point of view, while rehabilitating figures like Stalin and Pol Pot by calling them "national communists".

Although Dugin sees "racism" as a quintessentially Western "disease", it is not particularly difficult to find examples of it among traditional or archaic non-Western societies, especially if one defines racism as attitude of "seeing one's own ethnic group as normative". This is especially true of tribal societies, where the name of the tribe often simply means "humanity" and members of other tribes are seen as more or less non-human or as sub-human. For example :

"An instructive case is that of the Yanoama tribe of the Amazon Basin, whose name means 'humanity' and who regard all others as inferior beings, subhumans (nabä). They go even further: the members of a Yanoama village usually accentuate the small differences in dialect that separate them from those of the inhabitants of other villages and laugh at them because they consider them less completely Yanoama than they do, c 'that is to say, a bit like sub-humans "(14).

Furthermore, Dugin makes no distinction between the recognition of race as reality and racism in the sense of racial supremacy. An example of imperialist racism (white supremacy) would be this statement made by Winston Churchill in 1937:

"I do not accept that the dog in the feeder is finally entitled to the feeder, even if he has been lying there for a very long time. I do not accept this right. I don't accept, for example, that the Redskins of America or the black people of Australia have been done any great harm. I don't agree that these people have been wronged simply because a stronger race, a higher rank race, or at least a more knowledgeable race, to put it that way, come and take their place (15. "

The vast majority of American "white nationalists" or European ethno-nationalists today, however, are much less "racist" or "supremacist" than Winston Churchill. Even those who believe that the white race is naturally superior to other races, as opposed to simply acknowledging the reality of racial specificity, generally do not see this superiority as a moral justification for the slavery or genocide of other races. For the most part, contemporary racists simply assert the right to racial separatism and the right of every race to build a society in line with itself and to cultivate its unique characteristics and possibilities.

As to the historical validity of Dugin's interpretation of National Socialism as a project of world domination (the creation of a "planetary Reich" analogous to world communism or world liberalism), it is questionable to say the least. Not all National Socialists accepted the idea of Germany's world domination, as this statement by Leon Degrelle demonstrates:

"German racism has been deliberately distorted. It was never directed against any other race. It was pro-German racism. He was anxious to make the Germanic race a strong and healthy race in every way. Hitler had nothing to do with millions of degenerates, if he was within his reach to do without them. Today alcoholism and drug addiction are spread everywhere. Hitler cared about the good health of Germanic families, made sure that they raised healthy children to renew a healthy nation. German racism meant a rediscovery of the creative values of their own race, a discovery of their own culture. It was a search for the excellent; a remarkable idea. National Socialist racism was not against other races, it was for its own race. He aimed to defend and improve the breed and wanted all other races to do the same for their own race. "

The claim that the concept of race has no biological basis, or that if it does, it cannot help explain contemporary reality, is obviously wrong. But Dugin follows postmodern thinkers like Foucault and Althusser in arguing that besides race all political subjects are constructs. Race is a product of society and not vice versa, society is a product of race. Man, according to him, exists as a subject only in the political realm. "What man is does not come from himself as an individual, but from politics. It is politics that defines man. It is the political system that gives us our shape. In addition, the political system has intellectual and conceptual power as well as unlimited potential for transformation. "In other words, the subject does not create himself, he is not a natural given like the race or the individual. The subject is a construction, which only exists in a political system.

It follows that, ultimately, there is no sovereign subject who creates or exercises control over the system. On the contrary: subjects exist only as functions, produced by political structures without a

subject. As the political system shifts from one historical paradigm to another - from traditional society to modern society, for example - it builds the normative kind of subjectivity it needs to function. "The political notion of man is the concept of man as such, which is implanted in us by the state or the political system. The politician is a special way of relating man to this state and the political system. [...] We believe that we are *causa sui*, that we have self-generated and only then do we find ourselves in the political sphere. In fact, it is politics that constitutes us. [...] The anthropological structure of man changes when one political system replaces another". In other words, the subject cannot bring about a political paradigm shift on their own initiative - it is the new paradigm that will give birth to a new subject through a process of "questioning". The study of anthropological evolution from the type of man belonging to traditional society to the type of man belonging to modern society leads to the relativization not only of modern man, but of modern rationality as such. This relativization of modernity is "postmodernity". The modern idea of progress towards a unified humanity on the basis of Universal Reason turns out to be an illusion, which implies that traditional societies are placed on the same level as modern society.

In short, the argument is this: the subject cannot break the system (lead a revolution or bring about a "paradigm shift") and overcome it, if he is himself a product of the system, which does not 'exist only within the limits of this system. This is why class, race and the individual, all of which are constituted and defined subjects within the framework of modernity, have failed to overcome the crisis and dead ends of modernity. In short, the subject should be based on some sort of Archimedes point outside the political system, in order to have the necessary leverage for radical political action. One would have to be a "radical subject" and, for Dugin, the "radical subject" can only be chaos. Chaos is freedom which has not yet been confined within the confines of the bourgeois humanist conception of the individual. The disintegration of the liberal individual is not the negation of freedom, but the revelation of the essence of freedom as sovereign anarchic chaos.

The political subject acts in the field of politics. Ideologically, however, it must be grounded in an area prior to and above politics. In other words, the object of politics must go beyond the sphere of politics in order to be able to control, define and found it. For example, liberal ideology postulates the existence of the individual before the existence of the social order, in order to base the political order on the individual and his natural, universal rights. The National Socialists consider that race is a biological datum prior to and superior to politics and that the State has meaning only insofar as it is an instrument for the protection and preservation of race and for updating and improvement of its potential. This means that, for National Socialists, the race transcends the political domain, subordinating it to itself. The political consciousness to which they strive to awaken others is racial consciousness, in the same way that Marxists tried to sensitize the proletariat to class consciousness (16). For Marxists, the means of production go beyond the political domain, of which they form the material basis and the driving force. A class constitutes itself as a political subject by taking control of the means of production.

"The definition of a historical subject is the fundamental basis of political ideology in general and defines its structure."

For example, for nationalism, the real subjects of history are the nations, seen as a kind of super-people with a will and a destiny of their own. History is the history of nations. Identity is essentially national, and the friend / foe distinction (which is constitutive of politics, as Carl Schmitt has shown) depends on national borders. For racism, on the other hand, the real subjects of history are the different races, locked in a Darwinian struggle for life. The view of history is determined by modern concepts of biological evolution and progress. Identity is predominantly racial, and the friend / foe distinction has a racial basis. For Marxism, the subjects of history are classes, again seen as forms of collective subjectivity and, therefore, the whole of history has been interpreted as the history of class struggle. Identity is class identity, and the friend / foe distinction is determined by class.

The political subject is also a historical subject. This means that every modern political ideology corresponds to a "grand narrative" - a global interpretation - of history. History as a whole is considered to be created by the action of a certain historical subject. It then becomes evident that political ideologies are secular substitutes for a theological interpretation of history and that the historical subjects they posit in principle are substitutes for divine Providence, the transcendent subject of history. As Carl Schmitt has shown, all fundamental concepts of politics are secularized theological concepts.

The place of the political subject - the void left when God withdraws from the world and from history - is a place of contestation between different modern political ideologies. Each fought to occupy this vacant place with their own concept of political subject. Each claimed to have mastered the destructive and creative forces released by modernity and to have fully actualized modernity. Communism saw itself as the final, inevitable and culminating stage of modernity, for which industrial capitalism had only paved the way. Liberalism regards the progressive liberation of the individual as well as the processes of secularization, modernization and globalization as a historical necessity. Fascism saw itself as a vanguard, a revolutionary movement, rejected bourgeois liberal democracy as an outdated residue of the twentieth century and asserted that the organic state was the only adequate form for mobilizing the masses in modern societies. Italian fascism and German National Socialism both modernized and revolutionized their respective countries, which contributed to their political success. Fascism in its early days was influenced by the avant-garde modernism of Futurism, which called for the nihilistic destruction of the past and unconditionally worshipped modern technology and "progress."

(This is what led Evola to reject Futurism as a form of "Americanism" Marinetti retorted that his ideas were as far removed from his as those of an Eskimo. Strangely - for someone who claims to be a traditionalist (17). Dugin considers Futurism to be one of the admirable elements of the first fascism, which he wishes to take on board)

Each of these political systems, therefore, claimed to be the most appropriate form for technologically advanced, modern society. This form corresponds to a certain human type, an embodiment of a certain political project, the normative "man of the future": whether it is the homo soveticus, the new fascist man, the purified racist Aryan superman, or the enlightened bourgeois individual (18). In other words, each of these ideologies or "political theories" posited in principle a normative subject as the basis of its political vision and its interpretation of history. The transition to modernity in its full development was not only a political revolution, but also an anthropological revolution, the creation of a "new man".

According to Dugin, in the crisis of the end of modernity, besides race and class, the nation-state ceases to be an authentic political subject, even if it recognizes that the will to preserve national sovereignty is, in the current situation, a natural place of resistance to globalization. The "de-sovereignization" of the nation corresponds, philosophically speaking, to its desubjectivation. However, Dugin sees this "de-sovereignization" / de-subjectivization as inevitable and even as inherent in the very nature of the nation. He fully accepts the postmodern idea that the nation is an artificial, ideological and political construct, an "imaginary community" created to unify modern fragmented societies. The nation is, in his view, simply a sham, an artificial substitute for the lost totality of mainstream society (he seems to see the race itself as a modern sham of "ethnos"). Historically, its emergence corresponds to the precise moment when traditional society enters into crisis. This is a compromise, a form of transition, a ruse (19). In addition, he sees the nation as a device to facilitate the transition from pre-modern traditional society to modern civil and liberal society. As a result, the nation cannot be a lasting force of resistance to liberal globalization. He sees the nation as a device of power adapted to the production of a certain normative, standardized type of political subject: the bourgeois individual (the citizen). In doing so, it destroys organic ethnic, regional communities (for example, by the abolition of regional dialects in Italy and France and the imposition of a standardized national language) as well as the liquidation of the last residues of traditional elites (the aristocracy). Thus, the concept of "ethno-nationalism" is, in his view, ultimately an absolute contradiction in terms: the nation is inherently "ethnocidal". It destroys the ethnic group and replaces it with a "demos". Nationalism, according to Dugin, must be condemned not only because it has been the cause of so many wars, but because the nation itself is inherently violent - violent in the sense that it is an arbitrary construct without a transcendent basis, sacred. Its violence is the violence of modernity itself (admittedly this is true of many countries, perhaps more particularly of the nation of Israel, which is a completely modern artificial construction, as arguably is the idea that Jews are a unified and homogeneous race or ethnic group). To date, however, there is no indication that the idea of a Russian-dominated Eurasian Empire would be less artificial, violent or "ethnocidal."

(The new post-war European order prepared by the dominant Waffen SS faction was not based on the nation-state, but on a pan-European federation of culturally autonomous regions. Dugin omits to mention this fact, but he does must say that his characterization of National Socialism is tendentious)

As for the fascist notion of the organic state, based on the Hegelian philosophy of the state, Dugin does not explain the reasons why he rejects the credible idea that it might be suitable for the political subject. In general, Dugin simply takes the defeat of the second and third political theories as axiomatic, without providing anything that resembles strong arguments. According to him, modernity has been fully actualized in liberal society, and as a result, ideological rivalries in modernity are over. This view probably applies more to communism than to fascism. The death of communism was, as Dominique Venner wrote, an "inglorious disappearance". Its collapse is due to its own bureaucratic inertia and its inability to manage economic development. By contrast, fascism and National Socialism were spectacularly successful political experiments, and perhaps for this reason they had to be destroyed militarily by their international competitors. Dugin clearly attributes the defeat of National Socialist Germany to its anti-Russian and anti-Communist policies. As Dugin sees these two policies as linked to the infection of National Socialism by Atlanticism and Anglo-Saxon biological racism, he considers that

the defeat of the third way is the consequence of ideological errors and not simply a contingency. historical. In his eyes, apart from the fact that National Socialist Nordicism was a vulgar and materialist misinterpretation of the traditional doctrine of the North as a pole of tradition, National Socialism was anti-Communist and anti-Slav because it was anti-Eastern. , that is, pro-Western (modern). Today, according to the Eurasists (who in this respect are the heirs of National-Bolshevism), European nationalists are repeating the disastrous mistakes of German National Socialists, when they again oppose the 'East' under the form of Islamization. Usually, eurasists try to downplay the idea of a "clash of civilizations" or any claim that there is clear opposition between Islam and European civilization. They accuse nationalists who view Islam as incompatible with European values of confusing "Europe" with "the West". Any interpretation of European history that the values of the Enlightenment are rooted in European tradition itself - in classical Greece, for example (20) - is accused of attempting to legitimize the "West" by inventing historical precedents. and by falsifying the true European tradition (21). Liberalism has triumphed because it can legitimately claim to be the most successful actualization of the potential of modernity. Liberalism has indeed succeeded in modernizing the West to a much greater degree than communism has succeeded in modernizing the countries of the Eastern bloc, so that the "West" and in particular the United States are now more or less synonymous with modernity. In the decades following World War II, capitalism, using economic means, modernized Western European societies to a degree that fascism never imagined, making third-way ideologies appear archaic and obsolete in comparison.

It is possible that Dugin is following in Heidegger's footsteps by seeing nationalism as a kind of "anthropologism" (cf. "Letter on Humanism"). What Heidegger means by this is that nationalism, like Marxism, places man, rather than Being, at the center of history. Nationalism is "subjectivism" in the sense that it considers man as the subject of history. In this sense, nationalism is indeed a modern phenomenon, for modernity, for Heidegger, is essentially an epoch in the history of metaphysics which is dominated by the philosophy of the subject. It starts from Descartes' cogito: the rational subject as a solid foundation for philosophy and science. Descartes identifies the subject with reason (ratio). This view became the metaphysical foundation of the Enlightenment and its anthropology (22)

Why does Dugin give the Heideggerian concept of Dasein the central role in the fourth political theory? Heidegger developed his analysis of Dasein to try to overcome the abstractions of the metaphysical concept of subject. Therefore, his "analysis of Dasein" offers the possibility of going beyond modern political ideologies based on various interpretations of the subject. Dasein is beyond, or before, the subject-object division. Dasein is not the rational subject as the abstract foundation of the notion of universal man. Dasein is the historical, spatiotemporal structure of concrete existence. The subject is outside the world and is related to the world as a system of objects. Dasein has always existed in the world, it is involved in it, it struggles there. The world, to use Heidegger's very expression, is a collection of meaningful relationships. Everything refers to other things in an endless circular web of relationships. The relationship of Dasein to these things is one of understanding and interpretation and not (essentially) of objectification.

The subject is reason, that is, it is defined by its relation to a cause and an ultimate foundation (Grund). Dasein is defined by its relation to finitude, death and the abyss (Ab-Grund). However, it is not clear how

Dasein, which Heidegger says is precisely not the subject, can be called the "subject" of the Fourth Political Theory. Dasein is not a subject who arbitrarily imposes his will, creates himself from nothing, or freely makes history. It is part of a cosmic process which transcends man and his action. Man does not decide the history of Being. Heidegger does not care to re-elaborate or modify the concept of subject, any more than he does not care to bring man back to "God and to tradition" as metaphysical foundations, but tries to go beyond metaphysics itself. even, that is to say, all thought taking as "foundation" (Grund) the Being of beings. It also means that Heidegger is far from conceptions of "traditionalism".

Since Dugin invokes Heidegger and the analysis of Dasein, one can assume that his critique of liberalism and the West hides an attempt to critique modernity as such (identified with the West). The Heideggerian critique of modernity is linked to an attempt to go beyond the philosophy of the subject. For Heidegger, modernity, when the humanitarian masks of the Enlightenment fall, is technological nihilism and this nihilism is the fatal consequence of Western metaphysics. Western metaphysics, however, is the foundation of Western civilization as a whole (23).

Heidegger's critique is not simply political. He criticizes Bolshevism, liberalism (which paved the way for Bolshevism) and other modern ideologies for failing to capture not only their own essence, but the essence of modernity itself: technological nihilism. The emancipation of the subject is not the goal of technological development. Quite the contrary - the emancipation of the subject is a means of emancipation of technology. The last glimmers of transcendence have faded into the world, so that technology can pursue, in complete freedom and on a planetary scale, the infinite circular self-reinforcement of its productive power, sucking everything in its whirlwind, with no other ultimate goal than power for itself. The West becomes das Abendland (24), the side where the sun sets, the realm of the darkening of the divine, of the withdrawal of the gods. Technology like Gestell is not mastered by man (the subject), but turns out to be the impersonal fate of Being itself. Man as a subject can never master technology, but as a subject he is "subdued" by technology, to the extent that the essence of technology like Gestell constitutes man as subject. Technological development has no inherent limit, and no border can be arbitrarily set there as long as thought remains confined within the framework of the subject's philosophy (humanism) and technological calculation (the ultimate deviation from the Western logos.) (25). But, even as modern technology fully actualizes its dominance, the subject it spawns goes into crisis, begins to "disappear." It is liquidated in a system of purely functional relations deprived of a center, of fixed norms and of solid foundations. The essence of the object turns out to be a kind of limit, which initially was a necessary condition, but is now only an obstacle to be overcome. For Heidegger, this threshold, this ultimate crisis of nihilism - provoked by technology itself - opens up the possibility of thinking the essence of man and of Being in a much deeper dimension, beyond object. Instead of thinking of man as a subject, Heidegger tries to think of the historicity of Dasein. This is why the "inner truth" of National Socialism meant for him the confrontation between modern technology and the "historical man" (ie man, but not as a subject).

For Heidegger, Western modernity and materialism are not, as the traditionalists assert, the consequence of a mysterious crisis in the traditional society of medieval Europe. On the contrary, he sees the passage from the Middle Ages to the modern era as an evolution rather than a radical break

with the traditional past. For Heidegger, medieval scholasticism, by wrongly assimilating the Greek logos to ratio and by proposing an onto-theological synthesis of Greek philosophy and Christianity, prepared the ground for Descartes' rationalism. In a sense, Heidegger develops Nietzsche's idea that nihilism is not so much a break with Christianity as a revelation of the nihilistic essence of Christianity. As a Christian and a traditionalist, Dugin systematically avoids the anti-Christian aspect of Heidegger's thought, without being able to criticize it. For Heidegger, as for the majority of conservative revolutionaries, the origin of modernity is Christian, or rather it lies in the "onto-theological" synthesis of Christianity and Greek metaphysics. It is the Christian conception of the "sovereignty" of God over the world as creation that determines the modern notion of the object, just like the Christian notion of the free individual in personal relationship with God and the Christian problem of the salvation of the object. the immortal soul of all individuals is the origin of modern mass individualism. It is God as "supreme being" - both *causa sui* and *causa prima*, first cause, sovereign over all other beings and "creator" of the world - who is at the origin of the sovereign subject whose relationship to things is. that of manipulation and instrumental objectification. Modern secular humanism is onto-theological: it has its origin not in Greek thought, but in Christianity and the Christian interpretation of Greek thought.

In any case, following Heidegger, we can agree that race, insofar as it is conceived as a purely biological, human characteristic, is insufficient as a political subject, or rather that it is too narrowly anthropological and must be integrated into a deeper design. It is not quite the same as liquidating the notion of race. This implies the rejection of certain extreme forms of racism, where the biological notion of race plays a reducing role analogous to that of the Marxist concept of material foundation which determines the ideological superstructure (culture, mentality, etc.) of a society.

Man is not the unconditioned, self-generated subject of modern metaphysics. Human existence is conditioned and limited - men are, as Jünger wrote, "the children of the earth" (26). Race is one of the many earthly conditions of human existence. A historical world is not an *ex nihilo*, arbitrary and unconditional construction. There is, to use Heidegger's expression, a struggle between the world and the earth - the world, an articulated historical space of possibilities and decisions and the conditions set by the unobjectified elementary forces of the earth, whose blood. Blood takes on the meaning of destiny in a historical world (which does not mean that it is an arbitrary historical and social construction). For Heidegger, the limits set by the biological potentialities of human beings are not arbitrary historical creations - what is historical is the figure or constellation of particular relationships that gives them meaning.

2124/5000

We can also note that the statistical concept of race to which realistic racists refer today is very different from National Socialist racial theories, which were based on the idea of racial purity (27) and which, in form that they take on today (28), are not sufficient as such to give an overall account of the specificity of our civilization or our culture, nor of other civilizations or other cultures. The differences between the mentality of Americans of European origin and the mentality of Europeans underline this clearly (29).

Intuitively, however, we understand that race plays a role in the general character of civilizations and that genetic research will increasingly confirm this intuition in the future.

Dugin considers the Marxist concept of class to be useful and "very interesting" as a tool for the ideological critique of the mystifications of liberal bourgeois society. However, he regards Marxist materialism as reductive and recognizes that the class is no longer today a credible contender for political subjectivity (i.e. action), because the class structure of society largely dissolved (probably as a result of the atomization and gentrification of society as a whole - as well as technological developments). He also recognizes that ethnic conflicts are often at the root of class struggle and not the other way around. One wonders why Dugin cannot, in the same spirit, recognize that the concept of race is also legitimate from the point of view of science and heuristically useful, even if it means rejecting an overly simplistic application. In my opinion, this has to do with the fact that he is an ideologue and not a genuine thinker. Eurasism is an ideology specially designed to meet the geopolitical ambitions of contemporary Russia. Russia is a multiracial and multicultural empire, and the Russian identity has been, since the "great patriotic war" against Germany, deeply anti-fascist.

Giuliano A. Malvicini, "Race," Ethnos "and" The Fourth Political Theory "" -

<http://democratia-mortui.blogspot.co.uk/2014/04/race-ethnos-and-fourth-political-theory.html>, translated from English by B. K.

(*) See, for example, L. Delattre, *A Spy at the Heart of the Third Reich*.

(**) The trial of members of Nationalsozialistischer Untergrund was held in Munich in May 2013. The group was accused of racially motivated murders. It soon turned out that a number of the members were police informants and had instigated others to commit racist crimes (http://voiceofrussia.com/2013_05_07/Neo-Nazis-trial - in Germany-Several-NSU-members-were-informers-lawyer /) Ten years earlier, one of the co-founders of the NPD (Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands) had to admit to the court that he was "from day one" an informant from the German secret service (<http://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2002/01/npd-j30.html>).

(***) <http://www.theoccidentalobserver.net/2014/05/alexander-dugins-4-political-theory-is-for-the-russian-empire-not-for-european-ethno-nationalists/> (translated into French at <https://www.jeune-nation.com/geopolitique/la-4e-theorie-politique-dalexandre-douguine-est-pour-lempire-russe-pas-pour-les-ethno-nationalistes-europeens> - par domitius-corbulon.html), which we have just discovered, fully supports it, right up to its conclusion. Incidentally, in the countries of the West where Dugin is having some success, it is too little known that his father was a member of the KGB and that in the late 1980s he was part of Pamyat, a group of agitators. nationalists whom some have suspected of having been, if not created, at least supported by the KGB (<http://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6abb558.html>). As far as Eurasism is concerned, it may be useful to know that Nikolai Sergeyevich Troubetzkoy (1890-1930), one of the instigators of Eurasism and also one of the leaders of the insurgency of the

Decembrists in 1825, was, like his father and grandfather, a Freemason (see Fr. Dennis Stoks, Russian Freemasonry)

1959/5000

(1) The Stoics and in particular the Phoenician Zeno of Citium, trained in the school of the Sophists, said nothing else. Ed.

(2) Dugin can swear to his great gods that "Eurasism is not universalism; it is a patriotism of the land, of the Heartland (sic), of the Great Continent. Eurasism is not addressed only to Russia, but to all Eurasian peoples who want to preserve their identity and their dignity ", this surge is contradicted by the Eurasianist desire to make alliance with anti-liberal factions of North African origin or sub-Saharan, unless, of course, the North Africans and black Africans are part of the Eurasian peoples. In practice, this utopian alliance means an inverted globalism. Basically, both liberalism and eurasism see all peoples as dependent on each other and as constituting one human community. The human community of liberalism is formed by the scoundrels above; the human community of eurasism, the scum from below. Ed.

(3) The "left" and the "right", after having had an illusion until the middle of the 20th century, are today so little distinguished ideologically and politically, as the author of the article, that we cannot fault Dugin on this point. Ed.

(4) The quotes from The Fourth Political Theory are here translated from English. Ed.

(5) At the beginning of the 20th century, the essayist, historian and philosopher Coudenhove-Kalergi, one of the fathers of Europe, as there were the fathers of the Church, already declared: "Man, in the near future, will be a mestizo. ", More exactly a "eurasiatic-negroid ", " whose outward appearance will be similar to that of Ancient Egypt [and which] will replace the diversity of peoples with the diversity of individuals ". It is true that the individual in question was himself a mixed race: Austro-Japanese, to make no mistake about it. Ed.

(6) See A. Dugin, "The Magic Disillusion of a Nationalist Intellectual". Apart from the judicious observations made by J. Evola on the resemblances between the United States and the USSR apparently not caught the attention of Dugin, many of his compatriots who, visiting the States United, have noticed and underlined the affinities of the United States and the Russian. "No other nation," said Russian actor and theater director Stanislavsky, "is as deeply attached to [art] as America and, in this regard, Russian and American souls are close." (L. Senelick, Stanislavsky: A Life in Letters, p. 446) Dale E. Peterson, professor of English and Russian at Amherst University in Massachusetts, draws parallels between African-American souls and Russian (see D. Pesman, Russia and Soul: An Exploration). Ed.

2721/5000

(7) The traditional views of the ancient Romans and ancient Scandinavians on these matters were no less normative than those of these races; the emancipation of women, the acceptance of homosexuality and the passage from education of character to a purely bookish education were the consequences of a

Semitization of their respective societies. Transvestite musicians and transvestite musicians entertained Mesopotamian rulers 3,500 years before a transvestite won the 2014 European Broadcasting Union competition and thrilled members of the pseudo-European pseudo-parliament. While it is shown that effeminacy enjoyed a certain public and institutional recognition in pre-Islamic society and in the early days of Arab Islamic society, transvestites, as Semitized as Europe may be, did not. - not yet - this status ("Effeminates of Early Medina", Journal of the American oriental Society, vol. 111, n° 4, October-December, 1991, p. 671-693; "Gender Irregularity as Entertainment: Institutionalized Transvestism at the Caliphate Court in Medieval Baghdad", in S. Farmer, Gender and Difference in the Middle Ages, S. Farmer, C. Braun Pasternack eds., pp. 45-72.). On the other hand, it is established that the culture from which Islam emerged knew the "cult of the epebes" and that homosexual practices were seen there as a symbol of social status - a sign of wealth and / or power, if although it is not surprising that such practices were later widespread among wealthy Muslims and the elite of the Islamic world (http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1231&context=utk_chanhonoproj). Not to mention those whose name is composed with the suffix in -philie. One of the common myths in modern Africa is that homosexuality is not an indigenous cultural practice, but a problem due to the white, even Arab, presence on this continent. However, scholarly research has shown the preponderance not only of homosexual behavior in many traditional African societies, but also the importance of models of identity formation and indigenous cosmogonies which invalidate the idea that this type of sexuality would only have developed through contact with foreign culture (S. Gikandi, Encyclopedia of African Literature, p. 311). Morally, as in any other way, white has no lessons to learn. Finally, Dugin, pro-gay rights, lacks logic in his thinking when he sees blacks' so-called rejection of homosexuality as a sign of their spiritual superiority over whites.

Regarding the very Christian claim of Dugin and the Eurasists that the "West" is "Evil", it echoes the diatribes of 20th century Slavophiles against "The Rotten West", which, it does not lack in spice, themselves find their origin in "the critique of the German Enlightenment Romantics, of certain aspects of the French Revolution and of the very beginnings of modern technical and materialist thought. (E. Benz, The Eastern Orthodox Church: Its Thought and Life, p. 190). Likewise, today Islam, not without a certain nerve, accuses the "West" of all evils. Ed.

(8) How Dugin supposes, as a good traditionalist, that, horresco audiens, the white race and the black race have the same tradition, naturally "primordial". Ed.

(9) "The very similar responsibility is connected with the act of eating animal food". Dugin probably means "meat", but writes "animal food", a slip all the more revealing since it is committed by an individual who is not far from being supporter of cannibalism. In any case, as regards the quotations from texts written by Dugin in English, we have taken the party to respect the syntax, if it is allowed to use this term here, the expression and the style of the author. , to the extent and only to the extent that this does not interfere with the understanding of its formulations. Ed.

(10) "without noticing it or denying its cannibal nature". Here, Dugin does not appear to follow his own reasoning. Logically, it can only mean the following: "without noticing it or acknowledging its cannibal nature" (without realizing it and without recognizing its cannibal character). Ed.

(11) The reference is not given. Ed.

(12) Precisely, these are metaphors, meta-phores. However, the Rig-Veda was influenced by Tamil literature very early on. Ed.

(13) Diogenes the cynic also found cannibalism, pacifism, prostitution, the pooling of women, etc. beautiful and pure. The Phoenician Zeno of Citium also found it beautiful and pure for a man to eat the flesh of his dead parents. Chrysippus, his disciple, added that observing the way animals live proves that no act is inappropriate, which proves that he would have benefited from writing less and observing animals more. Ed.

(14) B. Lincoln, *Death, War, and Sacrifice*, p 142.

(15) In C. Ponting, *Churchill*, p. 254. Ed.

(16) The analogy is only partially and even superficially valid, since class is a purely quantitative concept, while race is a potentially qualitative concept. Ed.

(17) "Any intentional 'traditionalist' must normally affirm himself to be 'anti-modern', but he can nonetheless be himself affected, without suspecting it, by modern ideas in some more or less form. attenuated, and therefore more difficult to discern, but nevertheless still corresponding in fact to one or the other of the stages that these ideas have gone through during their development" (R. Guénon). Ed.

(18) On the other hand, it should be observed that all the societies of the past also had their "type", their "figure", from Sparta to Rome, from China to Egypt via Christian Europe of the Christian "middle ages", even if it was not the object of a formulation: it was and, *nolens volens*, was perpetuated: there was therefore no reason to put it in a formula. The concept of a "new man" has a Biblical origin.

(19) Nationalism is a doctrine based on the exaltation of the idea of homeland or nation and a political movement of individuals who are aware of constituting a national community by virtue of factors, cultural or linguistic, which bind them. While everyone more or less accepts this minimal definition of nationalism, nationalism has assumed various forms, which prove to be difficult to categorize. In general, their classification is based on the distinction between the liberal-democratic nationalism which asserted itself in Europe during the first half of the 19th century and the nationalism of the second half of this century. This one conceived the nation as a coexistence of the community with the other nations on the basis of peace and equality (this point of view is typical, for example, of Mazzini), while this one, linked to the reaction against parliamentary democracy and against democratic and liberal ideology, promoted a national identity and culture and implied a belief in the superiority of one nation over others. The first appears as a form of transition, which accompanies the passage of political power from the aristocracy to the bourgeoisie; it is the degree immediately preceding the international forms of proletarian economic collectivism and the dissolution of all nations in a single human community, even if, for the needs of the globalist cause, the nations, emptied of all sovereignty, continue to exist formally. The second, based on what remains of national consciousness, can, provided it is led by nationalists, put the brakes on globalism and make it possible to reconstitute a state worthy of the name. Dugin is

right to criticize and reject the former, although, on the part of a National Bolshevik, this rejection and criticism are not without inconsistency. He does not see, or pretends not to see, the second, which he however knows from his reading of J. Evola. Ed.

(20) If the "values of the Enlightenment" are undoubtedly "rooted... in ancient Greece", that is to say in the philosophy of ancient Greece, it is to put the finger in the eye until elbow to identify the so-called "Greek" philosophy with values, let's not say European, since the term is anachronistic, but, in a typological sense, Aryan: <https://elementsdeducationraciale.wordpress.com/2013/10/01/la-liberte-un-concept-desclaves-2/>). Paradoxically, nationalists of this ilk defend Europe on the basis of values or concepts which they ignore to be of Semitic origin and, therefore, do not effectively defend it, but contribute to undermining it even more. Ed.

(21) Paradoxically, Dugin, whether he realizes it or not, is not wrong, insofar as it may well be that what is referred to as the "European tradition" is not also white that we tend to believe today (think carefully about the fact that the name of "Europe" is that of a Phoenician princess, that it has never been used to designate our continent in antiquity, that it was brought back into fashion at the end of the 8th century by ecclesiastics imbued with Levantine culture from the very Christian entourage of Charlemagne and that it was not until the 16th century that he began to be used to designate the whole of our continent. As for the term "European", it is attested for the first time, in its adjectival form (europenses), in L'Histoire Auguste by Ammien Marcelin, where it is not not used in the modern sense, only to reappear in literature until the 8th century, from the pen of a Mozarabic author (that is to say a Spanish Christian of whom, during the Arab domination, had retained, in exchange for allegiance, the free exercise of his worship), which uses it to qualify the troops of Charles Martel who defeated the Muslim Arab army at the battle of Tours and to which, because these troops represented Christendom, it seems to give a religious meaning: the Europenses would therefore be the Christians. Coudenhove-Kalergi does not go four ways: "Christianity, prepared ethically by the Jewish Essenes (John) and spiritually by the Jewish Alexandrians (philo), was a regenerated Judaism. As a Christian Europe, in spirit, is Jewish; as a moral, Europe is Jewish. "Almost all of European ethics are rooted in Judaism. All the protagonists of a morality, religious or not, from Augustine to Rousseau, Kant and Tolstoy, were chosen Jews in the intellectual sense; Nietzsche is the only non-Jewish moralist, the only pagan moralist in Europe. "

(22) It was already germinating in a number of schools of philosophy in antiquity. Ed.

(23) As paradoxical as it may seem to those who allow themselves to be imposed on the terminology of the enemy and go so far as to do so unconditionally, spontaneously, their, "western" is, at best, a purely geographical term and is not in no case can be superimposed on that of "white", as suggested by the considerations developed in the two preceding notes and those which follow. Ed.

(24) Comme Kwame Anthony Appiah „ There is no such thing as a western civilization, November 9, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/nov/09/western-civilisation-appiah-reith-lecture>), we consider that Western civilization does not exist, but for reasons radically different from those he puts forward.

The term *occidens* seems to have been used for the first time in the *Tusculans*, 24, where it means sunset ("occidente sole"). In the *Acts of the Martyrs of the East and the West*, published in 1748 by Estifan Awwad as-Simani (1771-1782), Archbishop of Apamea, from Chaldaic manuscripts of the 3rd or 4th century AD, the term of "East" covers Persia and that of "West" Palestine (Jean-François Godescard [abbot], *Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and other principal Saints*, new ed., t. 1, freely translated from I 'English, Paris, 1836, p. xix). The meaning of Occident is fixed with the division of the Roman Empire by Theodosius I in 395. *Partes occidentis* then designates "the territories located to the west of the line Sirmium-Lake Scodra in Europe and of the line which crossed the Gulf of Greater Sirte in North Africa, leaving to the empire of Arcadius the province of Libya II or Upper Libya and to the empire of Honorius Tripolitania, the demarcating line of languages being more generous for the West, since Latin was spoken by almost all the north of the Balkan peninsula with the exception of the province of Scythia ". After the fall of Rome in 476, "the term Occident designates the provinces of the collapsed empire which are ruled by barbarian kings as managers of the sole emperor, who resides in Constantinople" (Télémachos Loungēs, *Les ambassies byzantines en West: from the founding of the barbarian states until the Crusades (407-1096)*, TC Lounghis, 1980, p. 1; again, as Voltaire observes, perplexed, [*Œuvres complantes de Voltaire, Essay sur les mœurs*, t. 2, Delangle Frères, 1828, p. 193], was the word Occident applied to the Greek Empire or the Orient in certain accounts from the 9th century AD). *Tota occidentalis Europa*, according to Nithard (858), designates the empire of Charlemagne. In 1690, Furetière defined Occident as "the western part of the European continent; all the countries and peoples who inhabit it ". It therefore had a relative meaning. It was not until the nineteenth century that the term took, in international politics, the absolute meaning of "group of nations comprising the capitalist countries of Western Europe and the United States": that is to say the member states of NATO, which it has retained ever since. As for us, we retain its astronomical meaning of "region, part of the globe located towards the west, in relation to a given place", by virtue of which an inhabitant of the United States is a Westerner in relation to an inhabitant of the United States. 'Europe, an inhabitant of China a Westerner compared to an inhabitant of the United States, etc.

If we thus understand "Westerner", it is also because of the negative direction of *Occidens*, of *Occidere*, to fall, to fall, to be lost, annihilated. As the first Christians, like the Eurasianists, believed that the demons dwelled in the West, it is not surprising that he used this term for apologetic purposes. Lactantius writes: "[...] God ordered and divided the earth into two opposing parts, namely east and west, of which the east is deemed to be like God, who is the light and the illuminator of all things, and who makes us to be born to achieve eternal life. But the West is like the troublemaker and evil spirit, because it offends the light, always induces and brings darkness, and causes men to die and perish by sin. For as the light proceeds from the East, and in light is known the reason for living well, so in the West is darkness, and in darkness is contained death and perpetual damnation" (Lactantius, *Des divines institutions contre les gentils et idolâtres*, 1543, p. xl; Lactantius also said, speaking of the reign of Antichrist: "Then a dreadful desolation will spread throughout all the earth. And the cause of this devastation will be that the name Roman (I hate to say it, but however I will say it because it will be) will be removed from the earth; the Empire will return to Asia, the East will rule again, and the West will be subjugated [Henri-François de Vence, *The Holy Bible in Latin and in French*, vol. 13, 1750, p. 144]; we have modernized the spelling). Likewise, "[...] the Lord God planted a garden in Eden, on the eastern

side" Genesis, 2: 8). On the TO maps, medieval representations of the three continents known at the time, namely Asia, Africa and Europe, Asia occupies the entire upper part of the circle, while Europe and Africa share, one on the left, the other on the right, the lower part (see https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/CarTE_en_T#/media/Fichier:T_and_O_map_Guntherus_Ziner_1472.jpg; <https://www.bl.uk/fr-fr/medieval-english-french-manuscripts/articles/mapping-the-world>). How can we better visually express the domination of Asia over the world?

Hence the orientation of Christian buildings, from the first centuries of the Church. From the 6th century, their western towers were dedicated to Saint Michael, the leader of believers and the slayer of demons and devils, in order to protect the entrance. Until the end of the 7th century, the priest, with his gaze turned towards the front of the altar and the entrance to the church, prays *ad Dominum* towards the east, like the faithful (Jean Fournée, *The Last Judgment*, with the author, Paris, 1964; Jean Bouhier, *Lettres*, Paris, 1712, p. 117). Until the 15th century, any religious building was suitable for a prayer to the east. From the third century, baptism is preceded by a formula of "renunciation of the devil and it is turned towards the west, we learn from Jérôme (see Bergier [abbot], *Encyclopédie methodique*, t. 3, Paris, 1790, . p. 354) recited by the one who was about to receive this sacrament and it was also turned to the east that he made his profession of faith: "In the mysteries of baptism, we first renounce it. who is in the West and who dies in us with sins; and turned to the East, we make a pact with the Sun of Justice by promising to serve it" (Jérôme, cited in A. Kempeneers [abbot], "On the symbolic orientation of Christian churches." In *Annales de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, vol. 25, 2nd series, t. 5, p. 596; in Greek orthodoxy, the catechumen must also raise his hands as if to repel Satan); it was turned towards the west that the "possessed" was exorcised: "You have entered," said St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "into the vestibule of the baptistery, and standing against the West, which is the region of darkness, you were made to stretch out your hand and renounce Satan as if he were present. Then you turned to the East which is the symbolic land of light, and you said: I believe in God the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit (quoted in *ibid*, p. 397). The idea that the Oriens corresponded to Good and the West to Evil and that the West was to be fought in the name of the Oriens is found in the *Heliand* (or Poem from the Life of Jesus) and the *Altsächsische Genesis* (see Jürgen Fischer, *Oriens-Occidens-Europa: Begriff und Gedanke "Europa" in der Späten Antike und im frühen Mittelalter*, F. Steiner, 1957, p. 73), two epic poems composed in Old Saxon and which were intended for "pagans Who had not yet converted to Christianity. Frankish thought was steeped in the belief that the Frankish missionary church represented the Orientals in the struggle against Western "paganism" (Gillian M. Bediako, *Primal Religion and the Bible*: William Robertson Smith and His Heritage, Sheffield Academic Press, 1997, p. 26).

(25) If technology, of which generations of native Europeans, flattered by the school education they received, flattered themselves to have been the inventors and whose misdeeds have been skilfully used for several decades by the media to make them feel guilty, has developed well on our continent, this obviously does not mean that its premises germinated in the brains of white people, nor does the exhumation of a wooden plane dated 2300 BC in the temple of Abydos five years before one of the Wright brothers made the first controlled powered flight of an airplane means that it was designed by Egyptians or that the discovery of a 2000 year old electric battery in the vicinity of Baghdad a few years ago implies that its designers were of the Semitic race: races, ethnicities, individuals, have migrated over

the centuries, nothing says, as long as archaeological research does not establish it, that the place X where an artifact is discovered Y at one time Z was inhabited at the time it was conceived by individuals of the same race as that which inhabited it at the time of discovery; but: in the historical period, there is evidence that many of the inventions which have been attributed to whites for two centuries in the field of technology are in reality only applications of processes which had been developed by non-whites. Ed.

(26) More exactly, the "Worker" "is the son of the earth", the "child of Prometheus". Since Goethe, who had a black ancestor, we all know that the "western man", the white man, is Promethean by nature. We know less that Prometheus, in his capacity as Titan, takes us back to the first settlers of Greece, the Pelasgians, whose rites, customs and beliefs show that they were not a people of Indo-European origin.

(27) The concept of racial purity is to National Socialism what health is to the sick: as is A. Hitler, as certain passages from *Mein Kampf* attest, was perfectly aware that the German people were far from being racially pure, but did not intend to let them continue to degrade themselves, like the patient, while being aware of his state, far from wishing for his condition to worsen, would like to regain health.

(28) The Waffen SS are certainly not responsible for the more or less fanciful interpretations that dilettantes have given of their post-war principles. Ed.

(29) Perhaps these differences are not unrelated to the fact that, as W. Sombart observed in his time, America is a Jewish country down to its smallest recesses and Americanism a "distilled Jewish spirit", even if in the meantime the so-called European peoples have largely caught up with the Americans in this regard. Ed.

Race: Idea and Act

'TRADITION' ...OR 'TRADITIONALIST'?

**HERMETICISM/GNOSTICISM: JEWISH OR
ARYAN ORIGIN?**

**THE PHILOSOPHY OF BECOMING AND
PANTHEISTIC NATURALISM**

**NATIONAL SOCIALISM: WELTANSCAUNG OF
GERMENTUM**

EVOLA'S RACIAL DOCTRINE

**CHRIST [INSANITY?] IDENTITY: KOSHER OR
PRO-WHITE PSYOP?**

ORGANICISM

EMANATIONISM: BEING;

'THE ONE' ...AND THE JEW

ESOTERIC HITLERISM:

**HITLER, THE LAST AVATAR AND MANU, THE
MAN TO COME**

'Tradition'...or 'Traditionalist'?

The claims of the perennialists to have the capacity to critique 'modernism' or non-traditional initiatic gnosis as it were 'from on high', from an Olympian height, are only in part correct, as the 'perennialists' are themselves what they critique, namely children of 'modernity'.

With regards to perennialism it may be fairly spoken of as an attempt at most to reappropriate 'Tradition' and only in some ways a successful one. Specifically the attempt of Rene Guenon to critique modernity in light of his modernist construct 'integralism' is largely a failure as it draws upon the philosophy of modernity (philosophy 'per se' he himself declares not to be gnosis but at best a compass of orientation towards gnosis within the purely human realm of rationalist cognition, of verbal linguistic rationalist construction), of the anti-Traditional philosophy of such as Thomas Aquinas the father of catholic theology from the 12th century C.E and the decayed remnants of what he propounds as authentic Traditions such as Hinduism; Daoism and Islam.

These pseudo-traditions were and are from their beginning a mere arbitrary syncretism of elements that were formed in the region by the hybrid 'racial' stocks.

Thus the 'crepuscular remnants' as Julius Evola spoke of these pseudo-'traditions' are merely the shattered diamonds of pre-history which derive themselves from the Hyperborean stock and its polar migrations from the epicenter of Aryan-Hyperborean expansion and are at best (and importantly) the pieces of Humpty Dumpty that are required to be put back together.

This must be done by the astute investigator not by the profane scholar alone but by the initiate who can understand the higher gnosis in the appropriate form, an inversion undergone from ivory tower and temple to privy wall and labor site.

Thus Guenon, though an initiate himself, was initiated into a 'gnosis' which itself was a product of the Kali Yuga and had available only the same remnants of initiatic Tradition to piece together. He erred in thinking that these remnants were authentic Spiritual 'Traditions' of 'The Tradition', the '*philosophia perennis*' and thus wholly assimilated these pseudo-traditions as a connoisseur consuming delicacies with hot dogs and potato chips on the side, naively assuming that he could penetrate the veil of appearances and unconceal the Truth with his purblind vision.

In addition his snide, contemptuous tone of know-it-all-ness implies that he assumed his assumed 'Truth' was Truth itself rather than merely his assumption and this he embodied in an authentic attempt at lived authenticity, forming a masonic lodge called 'The Great Triad' and becoming a sufi via the 'doorway' of Islam and living amidst arabs in Egypt. That

he lived with and even interbred with Arabs implies a lack of understanding of the Hyperborean Tradition and that only they who are pure may properly understand or embody that Tradition as they the pure, and they alone, are capable of understanding and embodying Tradition.

That he himself, being a Frenchman who was admittedly like nearly all French somewhat mixed with the arabs who had invaded their territory, may suggest why he assumed that such a path was authentic.

No doubt it bore some fruits but in the end as can be inferred from his writings it was an only partially successful attempt and created confusion in the minds of many especially those who themselves may have misunderstood his path and journey towards gnosis following that of Islam into the brambles of its theological dogma.

Thus Guenon, welding Thomistic philosophy (a jugglery of abstractions) with pseudo-Traditions and their distorted texts, especially those which were derivative of earlier forms of what had been welded to them (eg. the Upanishads welded to the Rg Veda to Vedism via hybridization) followed one blind alley after another along the path of pseudo-tradition using the compass of pseudo-philosophy and wound up with pseudo-gnosis or at best a half-truth which itself created perhaps more darkness than light and generated more confusion than clarity.

Truth clearly then does not lie at the end of the rainbow road of Guenon's corpus of 'perennialism' which is neither perennial nor seasonal save being another instance of the season of the Kali Yuga.

Thus we must turn from the dark alley of Abrahamic philosophy, of the false, gaslit cobble stone paths of Guenon and head towards the more natural, organic and perhaps well worn path of Evola. The path is one which most only understand at an ur-level of their being and which awakens the blood memory should one venture along it.

It appears to be a more rustic path alongside of which grow the flowers of wisdom in their variety and yet is oft-times crossed by the venomous creatures which lurk in the bushes who dart out occasionally and strike at the unwary traveller. Thus one must tread this path with a high degree of alertness and carry with him a stout walking stick and steel dagger in the event of footpads.

This path is an upwards path which winds along its course to the heights, to the mountain top and necessitates both the will and skill to tread it along the craggy rocks of organic Being which one confronts in the process-the will to dare the challenges posed by an active engagement in the unknown wilderness away from the well worn cobblestone streets of the temple and of the intellectual esthete who follows the path of Guenon as a sacerdotal

caste pampered priest, lying on silken cushions and amidst a surrounding of domesticity protected by the warrior caste over whom they superintend as a master over dogs.

The path of Evola bears, as the writer has discovered himself through his own travails, the fruits of wisdom, again only imperfectly, and yet they are bitter berries that furnish one with the insight to head in the proper direction. Evola thus leads towards a summit of Being for the adventurer that completes him as a person, a fully integrated person and which leads him to the open arms of the gods at its peak.

He critiques the currently extant institutions of religion and finds them lacking yet containing redeemable elements. Insofar he has a correct assessment of these and does not uphold or exalt them as 'Tradition' itself. He provides a concrete detailed map with which to navigate the world as it is and who the navigator is, who is emphasized (*gnother seuton*) as a person not a universalizable 'individual' be they initiate or profane and this *contra* Guenon who affirms the non-essentiality of racial distinction and hence went the way of all flesh through further mongrelization with an arab female.

Evola contrary to this point as evinced in such works as "*Synthesis of Racial Doctrine*" and "*Elements of Racial Education*" emphasizes the essentiality of race as the being for whom Tradition 'is', without whom Tradition 'is not'. A Tradition can only be the Tradition of a particular being and can never be that of 'all peoples' as no such thing as 'all peoples' exists.

Though Evola affirms that the mixture and crossings of hybridized mongrels are 'human' (hence 'universal') the writer affirms that the concept 'human' is merely a modernist construct of eighteenth century enlightenment philosophy and that a Tradition which is authentic can only be the possession of the authentic 'person', ie. an Aryan as all others are 'crepuscular remnants' and mixtures of the original Hyperborean stock.

Thus it can be understood that Evola himself, being a Sicilian, a hybridized type, understood that Tradition in all of its forms could only be affirmed and integrated into the degenerated stocks and was thus a battle to oppose the further degeneration *via* mixture of the white race.

Thus the path of Evola is a path towards clarity and the map he has drawn is drawn with some confusion of lines and cartographic errors but nonetheless is the best path to tread and must be trodden should one wish to salvage his soul and the racial soul of his race, his species, that of the Aryo-Germanic folk who inhere to varying degrees in all subtypes of this once pure species.

The task ahead is the recovery of Tradition and the 'traditionalists' may assist in heading in this direction towards the authentic Tradition of the authentic original race and may lead to a further (indeed is the only possible option) rectification of the fallen subtypes and from

thence a positive orientation towards a spiritual upliftment along the path towards the summit of Aryan mankind, the path of the gods towards the Olympian heights.

As to other modernists such as the Ariosophists and other nordic neopagans the value of their work lies in the attempted reconstruction of nordic spirituality, however it is itself looking through a glass darkly, taking for its sources those who have become intermeshed with christian ideology such as the Edda and are sparse and difficult to come by and thus not the best as a starting point from which to venture towards the heights.

Thus the nordicists, though pointing their compasses Northwards employ a map which has completely different topography and thus fail to reach their destination of necessity, the map not corresponding to the territory and the territory itself having become shifted and buried in the dust of time.

Thus the better path would be a rigorous investigation into the original formation of the Egyptian and Sumerian Tradition, both presumably colonies of Atlantis as means of recovery of Aryan Tradition, The earliest sources wherein whites were the initiators of the culture and this also in the most ancient sources of Tibetan Bon Po and Indian and 'Chinese' Spirituality will enable one to gather the metals with which to construct the key to the Tradition.

It must be remembered that still yet living Traditions are discoverable on the earth and can be found in the territory of the Yezidis in modern Iraq (ancient Sumeria) and the Balkan regions which still have vital rites and a spiritual tradition that may enable one to understand the Tradition of his ancestors.

Hermeticism/Gnosticism: Jewish or Aryan Origin?

A question arises as to whether what is called the 'Royal Art' (*Ars Regia*) is or has been a product of the creative genius of the Aryan or of the jews, whether it has been corrupted or distorted along the course of its history and if so how so. The tangled web of history is the cobweb that must be cleared away to reveal the Truth behind its grey and tenebrous veil and this with the hermeneutical broom of scholarship guided by the penetrating vision of the seer and of the initiate.

The writer contends that the initiatic sciences of alchemical transmutation are the property of the Hyperborean and have their place under the sign of the swastika which points towards eternity and Truth and which marks act the path of transcendence for the Aryan both as individual person (the Absolute personality) and as a race and enables his upward journey towards the stars.

Miguel Serrano, the esotericist and Chilean diplomat died in 2009 after a life of initiatic wisdom and teaching embodied in his 'esoteric Hitlerism'. He has forged the key to unlock the sinister mysteries of jewish intrusion into a Hyperborean gnosis through his magical dream language scholarship.

He reveals in coded language the upward path of the vama marg (the left hand path) and the counter clockwise direction back to Hyperborean along which it lead. Serrano thus equips the Aryan aspirant with the tools of initiation or at least brings him towards the threshold of the mysteries of Hyperborean gnosis.

The schools of the mysteries are derived if ever an origin could be fixed, from the North pole in a distant bygone age and have radiated outwards from this center like the swastika across all points of the globe and have now all but disappeared, owing in large part to the poisoning of the pure blood of the Aryan via mongrelization. Thus most of the mysteries have been submerged in the tide of mud and have become syncretized with the primitive cults of hybrids such as the mongols and negros and their crossings.

The history of secret societies is the history of history just as the history of race war undergirds these societies-societies work for their race or against, and all mixtures of kinds express themselves in syncretism in the mysteries. The jews, themselves, being a mongrelized synthesis of disparate kinds formulated as an extrapolation of their consciousness a syncretic madness which may be called the 'jewish kabbalah' from out of the pre-given kabbalistic elements that they managed to assimilate into themselves through their bloody trek through the ages: in Babylon; Egypt; Greece and Rome; perhaps earlier still from India as well and through the world subsequently creating a universalized hybrid artificial construct which they have overlaid upon the organic mysteries of the indigenous Aryans in whose countries they have worked their way in.

These Aryan mysteries were through history always oppositional to the 'Other' and never inclusive, save during periods of decadence brought about through the jewish purchase of titles and/or being granted citizenship as loan sharks useful to the nobility. Thus the Aryan has become subverted and the mysteries have become perverted under the influence of jewry who has introduced his own chaotic syncretism and most importantly his particularistic tribalism into the mysteries as means of crowning himself king and of inverting the power dynamic with himself becoming the head and the Aryan the tail in the relationship (the jewish reversal of Aryan values).

Thus it can be concluded from the above that the mysteries of today are a tangled gordion knot of jewish agency in large part and have now become subordinated to the supremacistic tendency of jewry who have taken the secrets of the temple and have perverted their usage in harming and enslaving the population. They have made the mysteries into a veritable iniquity and along with their christian psyop have hoodwinked

their goyim slaves to "bow before" them under the pretext of bowing before the jewish 'god' who is merely a simulacrum, a hologram before whom the broad masses have been coerced to subordinate themselves.

The christian psyop is a defilement of Truth which represents itself as having a monopoly on Truth but is inherently false and ingrains itself into the consciousness of the population, portraying True knowledge (gnosis) as devilish demonology and keeping the peasants as 'laiety' enchained to the master caste who obscure all light from the mind of the True gods of the earth.

Gnosis is available to the few but the parasitical jew makes bold in characteristic arrogance to claim it as his own creation when it is that of the Aryan, an inheritance by blood and through purity of blood through which he and he alone may discern Truth and pull aside the veils of appearance.

Such an act enables his transcendence from this material prison that the jews and their servants the modern freemasons have constructed. The masons exist as shabbos goyim 'spiritual jews'-liars, thieves and murderers just as the jews themselves and who voluntarily sells their soul and jeopardizes their racial soul in service to the jews themselves and carries out whatever agenda they impose upon him.

To wrest the mysteries from the white gloved hands of the jewdeo-masons must be the task for all Aryans as means of elevating the consciousness of their kind, of spiritualizing the racial soul and attuning it toward, the Absolute, not the false deity of the jew world order which is exalted as the unquestionable one and only all questions leading towards being burnt at the stake but rather the 'God' of the Aryans the Allfather, Solar-Uranian archetypes, hypostases of the skyfather deity who exists beyond the spatio-temporal conditions of the transcient phenomenal world.

For those who would uncover the mysteries they must look into them through the dark glass of modernity and to strengthen one's vision they must avail themselves of such sources as Julius Evola and his critique of the degeneration of the world and of culture and also that of Rene Guenon and Miguel Serrano as means of straightening out one's thinking on these issues.

No one else may offer any sufficiently detailed insight at this present time on this gordian knot of the mysteries and how to disentangle the skein so that one may finally make true progress, not 'progressivism', towards the Olympian heights, not the depths of the bog of jewry where their sinister rites are carried out under cover of darkness and bathed in the light of luna and in the flow of blood of their vampiric practices.

In order to combat jewry and their vile rites they must be exposed in the light of the sun and this through a rediscovery (recollection), through an unconcealment of the diamonds which lie in the shiny bog of the demonologists, their syncretic tellurism born of the depths and obscuring the light.

The war is a spiritual war and those who either deliberately place scales on their eyes such as christians rendering oneself blind to the light of Truth or who adopt the perverse practices of jewish distortion of their ancient Aryan Traditions will simply sink into the bog and to whatever degree of their influence pull down into the bog their own racial soul further submerging it from the light of day. A spiritual reawakening is necessary to fight against the dark forces and this comes in the form exclusively of a disentanglement of the Aryan gold from the judeochristian and jewish dross and to purify the alloy into philosophical gold.

Many attempts have been made and are being made to achieve this purpose throughout history such that a veritable 'golden cord' has continued from its origins and has preserved the Tradition to some extent though it is still confused. Organizations and figures other than Serrano, Guenon and Evola include the SS Order of the Third Reich, the Thule Gesellschaft, which preceded its formation and the Armanists who attempted to revive a variation of nordic-Teutonic spirituality exclusive to themselves; 'The Order of Nine Angles' a jewish government created psyop being another and more tainted example. However the SS Black Order and affiliates were presumably the pinnacle of Atlantean gnosis and this may still exist in some form or forms. For those not privileged to rank among them they must venture elsewhere.

These attempts have to all appearances failed or they are mere inventions, continuances of modernist syncretism without any legitimate foundations in any ur-racial group or culture save a romanticized nordicism without adequate depth or foundation upon which to base such practices.

The Armanen Futhark and other forms of rune yoga etc. appear ludicrous and formulated in many respects and seem to have no correlation with any esoteric principles of the occult anatomy such that they might amount to a transmutative influence on the mind according to occult principles. Thus appear to be mere pageantry and theatre that leads astray the consciousness of the population towards the artificial.

However they touch upon elements that are valid such as the runes and contain directions or paths that might be better beaten down and made accessible to the appropriate types of person susceptible to these same.

Thus this 'tradition' is tradition in name only but is an attempt presumably sincere which leads or assists in leading towards a rediscovery of Tradition. The most trustworthy

sources are not those which have been rediscovered in the far North the original land of Hyperborea, but rather those which may be uncovered from the warmer regions where the syncretic mixtures have not completely obliterated the traces of the original mythos and correlative mysteries.

Papyri and bas reliefs, cuneiform tablets, temples and statues are the most ancient sources and most trustworthy. Hence Sumeria; Egypt and the Mediterranean as well as the Balkans and central Asiatic region are those most worthy of investigation in their most concrete form and a synthesis thereof will help to untangle the gordian knot of the jewish distortion of Hyperborean Gnosis.

The Philosophy of Becoming and Pantheistic Naturalism

The philosophy of Nietzsche and later variants are schizophrenic: on the one hand they entail and prescribe, albeit allusively, a racist-völkisch weltanschauung and simultaneously entail a pantheistic naturalism that aligns itself with the near eastern "*Tradition of the Mother*", the pantheistic worldview of the middle east and 'Oneness' that it perpetually preaches as a 'moral imperative'.

This latter transforms only slightly into liberalism and its new age variants which all carry the torch of the old aeon only subtly modified to suit the contemporary context, the old aeon and the new all preaching "unity; equality; oneness" an undifferentiated 'volk chaos'. This is something that is accommodated by the Nietzschean worldview, as a philosophy of becoming and transformation of the Self, all concerning itself with a raceless individualism. A criticism of this perspective is that his latter works such as 'the will to power' entail a prescription of caste.

The potential saving grace of Nietzsche lies in the references to 'we Hyperboreans' and similar statements regarding the ancient Aryan (though he does not use the term, presumably taking it for granted during the Victorian age that the origins of India were known at the time, that being Aryan) caste system, etc.

All of this accommodates a racism-and yet this 'philosophy of becoming', of transience is compatible with the pantheism of a Spinoza in many respects the only difference being its dynamism and not its rigid Egyptian-jewish structure-one might say 'Parmenidean'.

The jewish religion is all about the mutable and the chaos of this world with an overlay of a religious dogma of inflexible top down control emanating from 'the One' in a neoplatonic sense such as with Philo the jew who was a great lover of the fatalism of his ego projection borne of his own chandal constitution. (self love, the gaze of the chandal into the vanity mirror of its consciousness).

Nietzsche's philosophy is that of immanence (immanentism) and not a transcendence of immanence, of 'becoming' (which he affirms is all there is) but a harnessing of the forces of becoming and a utilization thereof for the purpose of empowerment of the self for the creation of the superman, the 'illuminated one' presumably. This is the self-creation of the practitioner, the initiate, and as such his conception/philosophy is masonic, the 'lesser mysteries' being the realization of the Self as illuminated one, or 'lucifer'.

This is quite a jewish conception and Nietzsche's many poses for photographs in a masonic stance suggest he may also have been one, just as his relations with such jews as Paul Ree and Lou Andreas Solome (his jewish bette noire black widow spider)-who was presumably assigned him as a project to steer in the direction of the jewish elite such as the Frankfurters, Warburgs and others in Germany at the time.

The schizophrenia of Nietzsche suggests itself in his crude slander of the Germans and his attempt to deny the profundity of their culture (the most profound of all) and his exaltation of the barbarity and 'Dionysian' nature of the Greeks who were Dionysian (ie. luciferian-another instance of the "*Tradition of the Mother*") only during their decline and fall, during the hellenistic (ie. jewish-near eastern) phase of decay that brought about their supplantation with a healthier Roman stock of Doric Aryans who conquered the effete and 'Dionysian' Greeks with their Sol Invictus, The Apollonian principle Nietzsche castigated in his earlier writings while under the influence of the intoxication of his jewish honey trap's perfume. Indeed the jew Oscar Levy edited the entire corpus of Nietzsche's works in English and many of his works were and indeed are translated into English by jews such as Walter Kaufmann, etc.

The fact that Nietzsche's works are kept around and promoted even at this late time in the jewish white genocide agenda suggest they are at the very least using Nietzsche for their agenda of transmitting the 'philosophy of Becoming' of the "*Tradition of The Mother*", of pantheistic naturalism. This might be a use of Nietzsche in an abusive form, violating his authentic conception and philosophy of the superman, of will to power, etc. but the writer concludes that such a conception is basic illuminist doctrine in a philosophical form, a threshold into the lesser mysteries and is an anti-christian subversion presumably used to play off against christianity with other similar contemporary doctrines such as : Darwinism; Haekelism; Cometist positivism; Stirnirism; Marxism; Spiritism; Theosophy, etc. all either crudely materialistic bioanthropological creeds or luciferian egalitarian creeds (race-blind universalism-'equality').

A similar creed occurred with such as Martin Heidegger the national socialist philosophy who, though a member of the party was a student of the jew Edmund Husserl [the founder (or rather plagiarist of Franz Brentano) phenomenology] and was romantically/sexually involved with

Hanna Arendt his student the more or less marxist jew who wrote the book "*The Totalitarian Personality*".

Perhaps this is another instance of the honey trap that jews pawn off on these goyim who is often initially possess a racially oriented creed and are then used to manipulate and distort the genius towards their ends as a neutralization policy. Heidegger's philosophy follows from Nietzsche's as a 'philosophy of becoming' which is perhaps compatible with racialism but does not explicitly affirm a racist creed save perhaps at certain points making oblique references to jews and the concept of 'authenticity', that being a recognition of and living as oneself in his differentiated manifestation, ie. living as he is, 'existing his essence', in the words of the plagiarist communist jew Sartre.

The philosophy of Heidegger is an immanentism of a gnostic luciferian variety which posits existence as a being in the world (worldliness) and denies transcendence, attempting to associate it with a mere conception that derives from the 'logocentric' tradition and christianity (Being as the Logos, Time being the reality of Being or Reality itself, "immanentizing the eschaton" in the words of Robert Anton Wilson in his 'illuminatus').

Thus both Heidegger and Nietzsche as well as their affiliates and promoters and to some extent their forebears are serving the luciferian agenda of race blind universalist pantheistic naturalism, a re-presentation of the Mother Goddess Tradition, of the sum total of all things *qua* immanence, transience and oneself in relation to that perpetual void of chaos as a 'consort of the Mother Goddess', an Osiris, a Baal priest, a Lucifer, a priest of the Order of Melchizedek.

This is jewish priestcraft in a nutshell, the agenda for the formation of the god-man over others. This is the superman of Nietzsche and is almost certainly that of the jew. The comic book which began just after the passing of Nietzsche and during the ascension of the fascists and national socialism 'Superman' by the kabbalist jew Jerry Siegel is the archetype of jewish messianism-the jew *qua* superman, the master race over all.

Perhaps Nietzsche and Heidegger also were agents who had their healthier instincts distorted by their jewish honey traps and sponsors? Perhaps the superman was simply distorted by jews such as Jerry Siegel? And yet the 'Tradition of the Mother Goddess' and her consort Baal/Osiris/Dionysos/Lucifer/Wotan goes back a long way into the misty pasts of time.

Pantheistic naturalism is clearly a jewish religion and a jewish construct that has served jews for millenia during the entire course of the Piscean age, of the Kali Yuga. What is Truth then? One must dwell in Eternity to find out for dwelling in the transience of this world (worldliness) results only in the chaos of becoming and the trafficking with entities that render one an 'illuminati', a possessed being that has sold their soul for the false promise of 'philosophical gold'.

National Socialism: Weltanschauung of Germenism

The worldview of Hitler has become synonymous with the Race Idea, however it has done more to sully it than to glorify it. The Race Idea as embodied in pre-national socialist ('Nazi' for short, though this term contains slanderous connotations) ideas was moving in the direction of what Trotsky called "zoological materialism" regardless of the invention of the Nazis as codified in Hitler's "*Mein Kampf*" and presumably would have culminated in this ideology regardless and indeed did owing to the sum total of all factors existent at that time, the 'conjuncture' in the words of the marxist Althusser.

Thus the nazi ideology was the natural result of a biologicistic materialistic weltanschauung which derived from such as Darwin; Galton and Ernst Haeckel and the subsequent eugenics movement in America and other nations. The folkish ideology existed in Germany during the nineteenth century and was perpetuated in tandem with the aesthetic romanticism of Richard Wagner and even to some extent Nietzsche whose ideas are spoken of as "perversely distorted" by the nazis.

This may be to some extent true especially given the jewish influences which presumably informed Nietzsche's cryptic freemasonic-illuminist Dionysianism, his 'will zur macht' ethos of individualist illuminism. However Nietzsche had also some positive nationalistic sentiment though critical of the German people and this unduly and unjustly.

The Race Idea of nazism was formulated by the Thule Gesellschaft; Dietrich Eckhardt, etc. and was embodied in Adolf Hitler as its prophet in his magnum opus. The history of the Race Idea in Nazism discussed extensively by the lay scholar Peter Crawford who presumably (intentionally or no) draws false associations between the ideology and sex perversions (a characteristic jewdeo-masonic slander tactic, which slander in the opinion of the writer lends greater credibility to nazi).

Guido von List and Jorg Lanz von Leibenfels informed the ideology of Armanism and Ariosophy and were critiqued by Hitler in "*Mein Kampf*" as grey bearded wizened old men (referring to Guido von List) who were of no use to the national socialists as a political ideology or were at most stumbling blocks along its path or sources of escapist fantasy that lead astray from the concrete actualism of the political necessity of the times and thus were subversive and divisive.

Nonetheless the 'neopagan' nordicist elements underpinned Hitler's worldview. He was a subscriber to Leibenfels' "*Ostara*" magazine and was involved in occultism in the Thule Gesellschaft which was an occult fraternity. The orientation of national socialism nonetheless was concrete and political and attempted to assimilate these elements into

itself placing politics before the minutiae of what many have derisively called 'pagan reinactment' and which others would call a reawakening of the mythos of the blood.

'Blood and Soil' were the foundations of the weltanschauung, a biological race (ethnos) in a terrestrial/place (topos) and were both essential pillars of the temple of Wotan that was being constructed by Hitler. The biologicistic and naturalistic emphasis to the exclusion of all else rendered national socialism as a creed an excessively immanentist one which confined itself to the realm of maya, illusion, 'this world' or 'worldliness' without any principle of transcendence or higher planes of being. As such it was not a sustainable creed as having no spiritual dimension save that which was 'soulish' that which remained within the dimension of the phenomenal world of generation and corruption and which lacked any transcendent principle of Being through which to attune oneself to Deity.

In spite of Hitler's references to "the Lord" and his alleged Catholic background his entire philosophy lacked any spiritual dimension though it incorporated within itself elements from the Tradition of Hyperborean that led to a spiritual awakening such as the runes and the deities which participated in the One 'God' -Allfather- as hypostases, such as Thor, et.al. The Catholic encyclical of Pope Pius XI "*Mit Brennender Sorge*" reveals the position of the pope that national socialism was a spiritually dead, particularistic, naturalistic worldview which lacked the figure of christ and thus was considered 'heresy'.

Be that as it may the worldview is consistent with that of the jews at least in broad outline in terms of their pantheistic naturalism differing therefrom in positing the necessity of the preservation of a differentiated order over and against the jewish pantheism of an undifferentiated chaos with themselves in place of the jews as the 'master people' only as the 'honor people' (herrenvolk, the proper translation of this phrase) not a slaver people of dishonorable rogues.

Of course it was nonetheless supremacistic and expansionistic and allegedly entailed the extermination plan (as outlined in the suspect "*Zweites Buch*") for many East Europeans as means of colonialist expansion thus violating the autonomy of the East Europeans. Whether this is true or mere slander the writer is uncertain but the tone and character of "*Mein Kampf*" itself, bellicose and supremacistic and almost certainly expansionistic and possibly exterminationistic in its lebensraum protocol is inferrable. However not much evidence suggests this in practice as the East Europeans were treated well enough by the Germans and historical contingencies necessitated the invasion (reappropriation of land heavily populated by Germans) of Poland.

The ideology, though naturalistic, entails at least subtle hints of a form of emanationism or transcendent principle of Deity but the Deity being a mere affirmation without much in the way of content flirts with the kabbalistic Ain Soph Aur (the boundless light of nothingness) of the jew and posits man in relation to this 'God of forces' and thus accommodates a sort of

cryptic luciferianism where man and his supremacy is emphasized rather than confining it to the merely material plane. Insofar within such a merely naturalistic weltanschauung 'superman' of Nietzsche is indeed perverted and distorted into a violent and aggressive 'blond beast' thus transforming the spiritual man of Hyperborea and Atlantis, the blue eyed and blonde haired pure Nordic into a mere animal man bereft of Spiritual life.

This may very well have been the intention of the jews in defiling and sacrificing the Hyperborean stock and their descendants the Germans through contriving the national socialist ideology in the first place. However whether Hitler was who he is claimed to be and not merely an actor as well as the entire national socialist worldview is a question the writer cannot answer. The jews are notorious for setting up others and the casualties of the world war were by them 'justified' on the basis of the alleged and apparent 'aggression' of the nazis. This itself may have been a qabbalistic ritual with the war beginning in 1938, '38' being the number of death ($3+8=11$) and ending in 1945, ($4+5=9$, the number of finality in qabbalah).

The holocaust industry and the suppression of all racial ideas subsequent to the world war through its serving as a trauma-based mind control ritual served the jews in taking over the once white world and muddying it with their non-white hordes as the French revolution had also served to eliminate their aristocratic competition and to install themselves in a position of greater power. Thus the dialectic of the (false) enlightenment may have created the national socialist regime from the beginning and/or used it for their own purposes.

Oswald Spengler's aggressive tone and concomitant ideas as embodied in "*Prussianism and Socialism*" served as a forerunner of nazi ideology and since he was one-eighth jewish and installed in the jewish influenced Prussian regime the entire history of national socialism may simply have used the Germanic nationalist sentiment against the German people as means of painting them with the black brush of the black magician jews.

The philosophy or weltanschauung of national socialism is embodied most thoroughly in "*Mein Kampf*" and "*The Myth of the Twentieth Century*" of Alfred Rosenberg. Rosenberg's work derived from such sources as gnosticism and Marcion as the work "*The Philosophy of Alfred Rosenberg*" and "*Gnostic Origins of Alfred Rosenberg's Thought*" by the scholar James Whisker details. Rosenberg affirmed a Nordico-Aryan christ as far as the writer can recall and condemned the Catholic church as a crucible of Syrio-African demonology.

This is partly correct especially as Rome's decline and fall was brought about by the intrusion of Near Eastern and Mediterranean traders, the mongrel parasite caste turning Rome into a cloaca gentium which was then hijacked by the jews (though this is uncertain) and formed into the church and subsequent dark age and mass murder of Aryans as the church spread its dark presence over the whole empire. Rosenberg's work is largely an attempt to refute the Catholic church which apparently has accommodated jewry

throughout its history through the work of Maurice Pinay "*The Plot against The Church*" contends otherwise.

Most of the national socialist writings especially as outlined in the works of Helmut Stellrecht and Richard Walther Darré were of a naturalistic organicist orientation and thus the term "Blood and Soil", part of the title of Darré's work ("*Towards a New Aristocracy of Blood and Soil*") and the title of Rosenberg's smaller book "Blood and Honor" illustrate this emphasis which is again restrictive to the purely phenomenal world of 'becoming' or 'maya', the world of the 'here and now' and its transience.

However there were almost certainly other dimensions as the Nazi leadership themselves evince as in the case of Himmler who was a Hindu in the Vedic sense presumably and who was instrumental in attempting to recover the Aryan Tradition via the Ahnenerbe making investigations into Tibet and the Baltic and North Sea region as well as other ancient sites (eg. the Middle East). Anton Holzner's work also suggested an attempt at creating a Christianity oriented along the lines of Meister Eckhardt, a mystical pantheism with elements of Christianity in its doctrinal form. Perhaps this was a necessity at the time of Meister Eckhardt as well as that of Hitler to assimilate the penned up flock of the Catholic Church into their own fold and shepherd them towards what they believed to be the Truth and the light and to further disempower Jewry.

Perhaps however as the fruitage of National Socialism has borne out the "pestilential miasma from the East" were more greatly empowered both materially and demonically then disempowered through the Nazi influence? This is a difficult question to answer as, according to Miguel Serrano the Gnostic creator of 'Esoteric Hitlerism', Hitler lost in the material but won in the spiritual. His ideas 'won out' as the necessity of the usage of material force on the part of the 'allies' of Jew-Masonry proved, as a means of gaining a Pyrrhic victory in the material world and thus they lost in the spiritual plane. Whether the Christian doctrine of "winning by losing" is True and the Race Idea as codified in "*Mein Kampf*" and "*The Myth of The Twentieth Century*" will win out in the end has yet to be seen.

Julius Evola's work "*Notes on the Third Reich*" reveals criticism of the Third Reich, of National Socialism as an ideology as do his works "*The Myth of The Blood*" and "*Synthesis of Racial Doctrine*". However his insight is motivated largely by bias towards the purer Aryan stock and thus can only be viewed as a partial Truth. Blood, as Evola contends, transcends mere biological-materialistic states of being as 'Bios' means life in Greek and extends beyond the visible and tangible dimension and thus any sound mythos of the blood does not confine itself to the world of becoming. Perhaps the writer is wrong in his evaluation however of the Nazi mythos as presented in Rosenberg and Hitler's works?

The former (Rosenberg) wrote against another presumed agent Ludwig Klages who was attempting to bring down the National Socialist worldview to the level of immanentism and

attempting to propound the worthlessness and indeed the negative value of intellect, though Rosenberg himself stated that intellect was the adversary of the soul.

Klages was banned as were all manner of other occultist agents (Rudolf Steiner; Peryt Shou; Karl Spiesberger) who tied into the jewdeo-masonic pantheistic naturalism and thus it is inferrable that national socialism was a weltanschauung that opposed all of the pantheistic naturalism of the jews and the masonic collaborators, banning the masonic lodges of subversion and the jews themselves. Sound policy indeed.

Rosenberg's philosophy and Hitler's as well were perhaps too oriented towards the naturalistic sphere and yet to the extent they affirmed life and conceptualized it in language and symbol they are correct. Perhaps this Race Idea was limited this of necessity owing to the time and pressure under which they had to work to salvage their Race itself?

Perhaps the weltanschauung was in process of further elaboration and, standing on Truth, a provable and testable foundation required further research and this was the purpose of the Ahnenerbe? The writer, being a layman and not a member of any initiatic school of mysteries can only evaluate things from frog perspective, from the bottom looking up, amidst the quagmire of jewdeo-masonry and thus can only affirm that "the nazis got it right" in a qualified way and only as a partial Truth at least to the extent they publicized their true doctrine.

The pieces of the puzzle are deliberately obscured by jewry but Truth will reveal itself someday even should 'the world' of maya undergo a destructive cataclysm leaving nothing but rubble behind. In such an event the Hyperborean mythos will remain, redeemed as the Truth of the Race Idea and will exist regardless of the culture destroyer's influence having its place in the akashic records and the higher planes.

Julius Evola's "The Elements of Racial Education": A Synopsis

Julius Evola, a Sicilian nobleman and esotericist was throughout his life what he would describe as a man of race, one who embodied in himself an integrated tripartite form of being: body; soul and spirit. That this work concerns itself exclusively with the Aryan race necessarily follows given that it propounds such a conception of race: race of the body (1st degree); of the soul (2nd degree) and of the spirit (3rd degree), the latter element being the exclusive property of the Aryan race. According to Evola "Race is a profound force which manifests itself both within the corporeal frame (race of the body) and within the animic-spiritual frame (inner race, race of the spirit)".

Those who are not men of race in the sense of a tripartite integration but follow deviant paths or are hopelessly mongrelized beyond redemption, having an inner schism of body, soul and spirit will create

inharmony in a nation and further degrade the racial type opening up their soul to destructive influences and bringing all into the nadir of the Kali Yuga. In order to avoid the fate of disintegration, Evola advances a conception of Race "essentially dynamic, competitive and antagonistic" (Synthesis of Racial Doctrine, pg. 15), one against the cycles of time.

"The Elements of Racial Education" begins by examining the definitions of race formulated by contemporary bioanthropologists and racial psychologists spoken of at greater length in "The Myth of The Blood". The definition aids the reader in understanding what doctrines came before and their inadequacies *sub specie aeternitatis*.

Evola seeks to connect the physical bodies of men with the appropriate spiritual forces for the creation of a true aristocracy, one not rooted in a decadent rigid caste based on heredity but rather in a fluidic hierarchy in an organic state ruled by a new aristocracy of blood, soul and spirit, a 'super-race' adhering to the maxim 'Suum Quique' ("to each their own"): each member attaining their place in the state on the basis of both their inner and outer qualities.

This is not to say that he outlines a universal prescription for all of the sub-types of the white race-this would be conflictual with his conception of a differentiated order. "The doctrine in question, if correctly understood, can instead represent a strengthening and a further instrument of Fascism, as the creator of a new anti-universalistic, anti-rationalistic, anti-individualism civilization" (ibid., pg. 6). Evola emphasizes that "[t]his task is a matter of life or death for the future of the entire European civilization" (ibid., pg. 9).

Further the task of Racial education is not 'environmentalist' in the sense of a theoretical reliance upon external factors in society or the natural environment. For Evola, "to be racist[...]means to be explicitly aware and to know concretely that it is forces rooted inside of us, and not the mechanical and impersonal forces of the environment that are really determining for our life, our character and our vocations". Race is not a deterministic conception of the "heritage gathered from the ancestors and transmitted to the descendants" (fatalism) but rather which is a legacy that can be used or misused by its inheritors (destiny).

The task of racial education is to prescribe a correct usage of this inheritance and its attunement to the Divine Will embodied in the race and personalities of the 'men of race'. As discussed in "Synthesis of Racial Doctrine", Evola's racism is both anti-rationalist; anti-individualist and anti-evolutionary. In place of the rationalist universalism of judeo-masonry he affirms the innate qualities of race which are specific

to the Nordico-Aryan race and its sub-types- the qualities of character (integrity); the feeling of honor; courage and fidelity "in the intimate attitude towards the world and life" (pg.12). These are the defining traits of Aryan nobility.

He posits this in contradistinction to the men without qualities of humanist anti-race, the 'individual'. These innate qualities are vested in the personality not the 'individual', its modern antipode. The personality is "something organic, all that is blood, lineage and tradition are its constitutive and inseparable elements, so that, from the strengthening of these values-propitiated by racism-presumably it[self?] can only emerge strengthened and confirmed" (pg.10)

The starting point is an inner examination, meant to discover the "fundamental element in us, the 'own nature' or spiritual races in accordance with which we must essentially act". His conception of race adheres to his ethical-ontological conceptions which are encapsulated in the titles of two of his most prominent works "Ride The Tiger" and "Revolt Against the modern World"- in the former case as in the latter the racial idea orients around individuation, form and the preservation and spiritualization of the material forms incarnating the racial souls of their particular collective consciousness of differentiated groups of the white race.

"The Elements of Racial Education" was intended by its author Baron Julius Evola as a distillation of his larger theoretical works on race, one being the critical "The Myth of The Blood" (Il Mito Del Sangue) which synopsized and critiqued the various anthropological racial theories prevalent at the time of its writing (1937).

"The Myth of the Blood" critically examines prior bioanthropological and psycho-anthropological works starting with Arthur Comte de Gobineau's "Essay on the Inequality of Human Races" (1853) and Vacher De Lapouge ("L'Aryan", 1899) up to the time of its publication in 1937. Evola treats of the theories of Houston Stewart Chamberlain ("The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century",1899); the theory of heredity deriving from Gregor Mendel and reiterated by Francis Galton, Ernst Haeckel and Darwin (so called materialist 'scientific anthropology') and their descendants in the third Reich: Hitler; H.F.K.Gunther ("The Racial Elements of European History",1927) and his typology of Aryan sub-types and non-Aryan groups and Alfred Rosenberg ("The myth of the 20th Century",1930).

In "Synthesis of Racial Doctrine", a more positivistic work, Evola amplifies the racial doctrine herein condensed, a tripartite racial typology of Aryan man. Evola listened to the call of the blood, the mythos of the blood not the falsified dogma of the mythologization of the blood as was current in his time

amongst the semitic schools of Boas (anthropology); Freud (psychology); Husserl (phenomenology); Besant (theosophy) and Jaspers (existentialism) which he critiqued in the work "The Mask and Face of Contemporary Spiritualism"(1932). Instead he affirmed an authentic racial doctrine corresponding to the reality of life embodied by the authentic man, the man of race, whose body, soul and spirit exist in a harmonious relationship as different yet integrated aspects of existence.

"The racist vision of life", says Evola, "is symbolic: the inside manifests itself in the outside, what is external is symbol, sign and symptom of something internal." Racism in the sense of Evola is necessarily Traditionalist as all Traditions properly so-called derive from a race and are compatible only with that racial soul in order to be authentic (blood and soil is the formula for a particular cultural formation). "[T]he deeper substratum of any tradition worthy of the name[...] is the blood, the living race".

Thus Tradition is grounded in the type, inheres in the blood and is an epiphenomenon thereof-all culture is a concretion of a biological type at all ontological levels: body; soul and spirit and all of that which is not derived from thence is merely the distorted amalgam of anti-race. Religions such as Hinduism (a distortion of Vedism); contemporary Buddhism (a distortion of Theravada); christianity (a synthesis of near-eastern lunar semitic cults and mithraism with a jewish overlay) exemplify this expression of folk chaos, a cacophony of disparate cultures mixing but never forming any stable bond between them.

For Evola races are not purely physical or mechanistic in the sense of natural science and are "not the external forms themselves, but the potentialities, the constant ways of reacting[...]in conformity with certain laws". The "variation of the 'phenotype' ", the physical form or appearance is "not essential, but temporary and illusory. The potentiality remains intact, similar to the original type".

Evola's conception of physical racial groups subdivides according to the classification of H.F.K Gunther: Nordic and Western (Mediterranean) races; Phalian (Germanic) and Dinaric (Central European); Alpine/Eastern [Gallic?] and Baltic-Eastern, each of which, though mixed to a degree over millenia of conflict and congress with other non-aryan groups, nevertheless forms in principle a type which has peculiar to itself its own body, soul and spirit and which could reappear and reassert itself at least in the best specimens, with appropriate 'prophylactic' (ie. eugenic) measures.

"Racism in Evola's sense necessarily goes to consider as more normal and regular these forms of civilization of the early days, where mixings had not yet reached such a point [of irrecoverability] and where one can legitimately suppose the existence of sufficiently unaltered primary ethnic nuclei". (pg.16) The proto-Nordic-Aryan race, the "divine" or "heavenly" races of "remarkable spiritual stature"

are they from whom the modern Aryan sub-types are involuted products and mixtures with "absolutely inferior and extinct races" (such as homo neanderthalensis presumably), creating the 'fallen' man of today. Evola's the project is one of the redemption of this Divine quality.

The "infiltrations of alien races: Levantine race; Desert race; Mongoloid race; Negroid and Mediterranean-African race[and] the jewish element" are the dross which Evola seeks to purge as means of purifying and thereby strengthening the Aryan type. One means of achieving this is the existence or establishment "of favourable conditions in the countryside and in nature, in sane customs and in sane occupations" such as those which existed in Traditional societies and which are catalysts of the original Nordico-Aryan spirit in the creation of the thorough-bred man".

This work is a template for our times. Evola propounds a doctrine of race contained within a didactic guideline for racial education for Fascist Italy under Mussolini. However his work is necessarily that which transcends time as it is intended to be viewed *sub specie aeternitatis*. It is to be applied in time and adjusted for differentiating factors: body, soul and spirit. It is a template for genetico-spiritual eugenics against the current dysgenics of judeo-masonry and a solution to the mongrelization agenda of what is euphemistically called 'multi-culturalism'.

His work is a weapon designed to counter what he called the 'integrationist fanaticism' of judeo-masonry and the mainstream religious hierarchy and its paradoxical disintegrative outcome, a society of discord amidst the jarring cacophony of volk chaos with Evola's prescription of a higher form of integration of both person and the people with whom they belong.

In order to redeem themselves the Aryan races must extricate themselves from the slime pits in which they have allowed themselves to be ensnared. This is the task of "The Elements of Racial Education"- to prescribe a formula for eugenical improvement of the varied sub-types of Aryan man: to consolidate the type in its essential elements and discard the dross: both in genetics (selective breeding; forms of salubrious physical action-hardening the warrior within-race of 1st degree, the body); behaviorally (developing a template for certain forms of Aryan behavior to be integrated into the consciousness as a fundamental tendency-race of the second degree) and spiritually (attuning oneself to the Divine Will and adhering to the rites and modes of action which accorded with the classical tradition appropriate to the type-race of the third degree).

Hence "racialist research cannot be quantitative; it must go beyond the numerically predominant common outer elements". It must discover the "purest representative of the given type" and to discover

"what animates it, that is its inner race too, and, therefore, to have the sense of the original unity in which the various elements of the race come together".

This work is a living work as it is a necessary condition of the continuance of the being of Aryan man in all of his differentiated sub-types and their becoming who they are in essence. Failure to adopt the elements contained herein and to implement them both in one's life on a personal level (as a 'man of race', a differentiated type) in relations with others (mate selection, appropriate behavioral comportment towards friends, foes and neutral parties) and in the establishment of an organic state is to bring about the destruction of all in the name of a bastardized oneness of judeo-freemasonic 'humanitas'. hence the ethical imperative this work represents as a true education for the man of race, a leader of the type to which he belongs as an aristocrat of blood, soul and spirit.

Racism in the sense of Evola is thus an ethical imperative, the *conditio sine qua non* of one's being a person of Aryankind attuned to the spiritual formation of his race and living in accordance therewith. This will essentially preserve the type or racial oversoul which gives rise to his being and create a harmonious state of being for his collective and for himself.

The "anemic-spiritual frame" that circumscribes both race of the soul and of the spirit Evola amplifies through differentiating these two facets of race . "The race of the soul determines character, sensitivity, natural inclination, 'style' in action and reaction, and attitudes towards ones own experiences". The discipline whose subject matter it is he designates "psycho-anthropology" - it correlates with the psychological predispositions of the racial subtypes as per Ludwig Clauss and critiqued in "The Mythos of The Blood". Race and heredity are to be conceived "as forces, as potentialities, as formative energies from within and, to some extent, even from above" (Synthesis of Racial Doctrine, pg.14). This according to Evola is the "classical tendency of racism: will to form, aversion for the promiscuous: reassumption of the principles of our ancient wisdom, that is: know yourself and be yourself. Fidelity to one's nature, that is to say, to one's own blood and one's own race".

All forms of culture are either authentic or inauthentic and Evola seeks to attune the degraded remnant of the Aryan race in its component parts body, soul and spirit to bring it to a state where it can attain an authentic Tradition suitable to itself and lead the way back to the "heritage of light", "the light of the north" of the Aryan race in its Hyperborean origins. In short to reanimate the zombified corporeal form of Aryan man through an attunement to the Divine Will. The tradition of a race comprises its "various cultural, artistic, religious, ethical forms" which are "manifestations of the race of the soul and of the spirit". The so-called 'culture' of the modern world, that which the national socialists called *entartete kultur* (degenerate culture) is the inauthentic result of anti-race.

An example of an inauthentic man, one not of race but a 'ruin' (as Evola presented in his work "Men and Ruins" (1953), contrasting the man of race with the degenerate modern) is the current bourgeois intellectual in modern 'western civilization': an effeminized type who exists purely in a deviant form adopting a Jewish Dionysian hedonistic motivation ('maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain') and a lunar-feminine consciousness (deceitful-mercurial; loquacious; sarcastic; specious; dishonourable). Such a 'man' is anatomically male only and fails the standard of a spiritual virility that a masculinist embodies, one who is a man of race in the Solar-Olympian sense.

The place of women in Evola's masculinist racial conception adheres to the classical maxim of *sum quique* (to each his own): neither too high in social position as in the societies of the Lunar and Demetrian race nor too low as in the case of Asian societies. The libertinism inherent in liberalism and the despotism inherent in Near Eastern Abrahamic religion are both superseded with woman occupying her normal role in Traditional Aryan society.

The form in which a culture and a Tradition crystallizes is that of the organic state. For Evola "in the Fascist idea, the state is the instrument of a political elite, of the best part of the 'nation'. With racism[...] this elite is meant to reassume the heritage of the higher race and tradition existing in the national composite".

Evola stated "I'm not a fascist...I'm a super fascist" (Self-Defense Statement, 1951). His fascist conception purported to transcend the fascism of Il Duce Mussolini and the bourgeois philosopher Giovanni Gentile as expounded upon in their "The Doctrine of Fascism". In his work "Heathen Imperialism" (1933), Evola critiques this bourgeois state fascism and propounds a superior state form as the basis for an authentic tradition in the classical spirit of the Aryan Solar-Uranian consciousness which for Italians specifically means that the "suprace of the Italian nation is the race of Rome"... "The 'Aryo-Roman' race".

In "The Elements of Racial Education" the project entails both a negative eugenics which Evola calls 'prophylactic racism' or 'racial prophylaxis' and a positive eugenics that spans the tripartite conception of races of the body, soul and spirit. Racial prophylaxis is a cleansing or *nigredo* phase of the transmutation of the fallen sub-type of the Aryan race (most all somewhat mixed from their Hyperborean origins) and has a two-fold form: a defense against mixture between incompatible types which he outlines and an "isolation of elements in which race is already affected"; an excision so to speak of degraded or disintegrative elements in the composite sub-types in question- a purification of the type through, in its positive phase "an action of strengthening and inner selection".

The strengthening of the Aryan sub-type entails a positive aspect of mate selection in accordance with "the ancient aryan teachings about race ("Ancient Eugenics", Allen Roper, 1913) only modified by the knowledge of contemporary eugenics and physical bioanthropology. In a cross breeding, the masculine heredity would basically have the 'dominant' character, the feminine one, on the other hand, the 'recessive' one" meaning that the male genetico-spiritual race modifies that of the females' such that weak and inferior males degrade the type but weaker and inferior females do not necessarily do so-but are merely assimilated to the males' stock. This applies only within compatible types of the Aryan race as a whole and spans the tripartite form of race. Thus in place of the miscegenation prescribed by the hidden hand of the dark forces is posited a eugenics oriented selectivity based upon the classical, Aryan tradition. Evola's intent is to "enhance everything that is superior[reads 'inferior?'] and essential and differentiated in the face of the promiscuous, the acquired, and the constructed" (Synthesis of Racial Doctrine, pg.14)

The Racial idea outlined by Evola condemns the 'ruin' (degenerate man) involved in miscegenation or so-called 'race mixing' who he castigates as committing "an utter treachery towards his own blood and his ancestors and a crime in regard to one's descendants". This contrary to the contemporary falsifiers of Evola's ideas who would attempt to distort his conceptions to accomodate their globalist anti-race agenda. They would attempt to pervert interpreting his ideas of Race as merely a mystical state of quasi-freemasonic-gnostic illumination only of a more nebulous Abrahamic variety with an oligarchy of 'aristocrats of the soul', having no relationship with the race of the first degree, the body (physical race). Such, as outlined in his racial works is clearly not the case which explains why they are comparatively rare as deliberately neglected by mainstream publishers [such as Arkto; Inner Traditions and Counter-Currents].

Contrary to this nebulous universalism Evola eschews and condemns miscegenation (bad breeding) or incapable racial mixing he states emphatically that "when heterogeneous races cross[...]a disharmony and often an inner fragmentation comes about". Such a mixture forms no stable bond at any higher level and thus leads to the disintegration of the race should prophylactic measures not be taken. These hybrids create " 'mixed-up persons' ", "the inner force exhausting itself in all conflicts and functions of all sorts". In this hybridization of races only a "certain self-presence" or "creative tension" within compatible types may overcome that fragmentation and should that tension be lacking the types cannot be said to be compatible. Only the combination of elements that maintain the supportive conditions of the main core of the race in question can avoid that disintegrative process and this he emphasizes "especially in the spiritual field".

Miscegenation stems from the motivations of the weak links of the race-those whose "arbitrariness" of will and "passivity towards the impulses and feelings of his body" leads them to partake of the forbidden fruit of the racial foreigner. For Evola such a deviant "constitutes an utter treachery towards his own blood and his ancestors and a crime in regards to one's descendants". Over and against such deviant corruption Evola's Racial idea is formulated to curtail the dysgenics of modernity and the 'triumph of the underman' through the democratic weight of numbers, the reign of quantity.

The race of the spirit lies within the realm of spiritual being and all of that which is bound up therewith-that which transcends spatio-temporality and codifies itself in "speculative systems, myths and symbols, and in the diversity of religious experience itself". It is a separate yet integral discipline of racial education which serves as the trajectory of all sub-disciplines and constitutes the very purpose of Aryan life.

Similar to Alfred Rosenberg though positioned at the Olympian height of Spirit Evola focuses on the 'inner race' and does not fall into mere naturalism which other contemporary racial theorists had done in stating: "the outer is a function of the inner, the physical form is the instrument, expression and symbol of a psychic form" which parallels the words of the German ideologue "race is the image of soul" ("The Myth of the 20th Century"), only here race is portrayed in its inner dimension to a much greater degree and, unlike Rosenberg and other national socialist racial theorists is emphasized and given priority: Spirit over matter, yet animating and elevating it. The race of the spirit encompasses "the essential, the living race, the sense of connection not so much with the works of our ancestors as with the very forces from which such was derived in them-forces which continue in our blood, in the most mysterious and sacred strata of our being".

The sub-categories of the race of the Spirit Evola presents are seven-fold and to be found to varying degrees in each of the sub-types of the physical races of the Aryan save perhaps a few which are diametrically opposed to the Solar-Olympian super-race inherent in and defining all Aryan mankind. In the Solar or Olympian race the suprahuman element predominates as its fundamental trait connoted by the term 'Aryan' ('noble' in sanskrit, the noble metal of gold, an alchemical symbol of the sun of mind, of the higher spiritual consciousness). "The soul or style of soul most consonant with the Nordic physical type is that of the 'race of the active man', of the man who feels that the world is represented to him as material for possession and attack".

The antipode of the Aryan is the 'Telluric/Chthonic' earthly/subterranean race of the 'spirit' which could perhaps best be described as infernal and whose foremost representative is the anti-race jew which is treated of at greater length in Evola's work "Three Aspects of the Jewish Problem"(1936). Other Aryan

racial sub-types of the spirit are discussed and further expanded upon in "Synthesis of Racial Doctrine" the 'Lunar'/'Demetrian' ("which experiences spirituality passively, as a reflected illumination like the moon reflects the sun"); the 'Titanic' (which has "connection with the elementary forces" and which acts "according to a style of affirmation...yet, still, without light, or inner liberation") ; the 'Amazonian' ("which in its essence is 'lunar'[...]feminine"..."but which assumes affirmative, virile, forms of expression"); the 'Aphrodisian' ("spirituality which oscillates between love for beauty and form and the enjoyment of the senses"); the "Dionysian" (and its "exaltation of the impulses and an intense way of living based upon sensation")and the race of the heroes, the latter being a sort of classical tragic spiritual form with elements of the Dionysian.

These racial sub-types are correlated with both the second (soul) and first (body) degree of race in both authentic and inauthentic ways-the physical race being, though Evola does not explicitly state, presumably a concretion of the higher forms on the basis of the hermetic principle "that which is above is like unto that which is below". Those physical races who have assumed or who have become entangled in inauthentic forms of soul or spirit through inner decadence or being overcome by a greater force would be considered inauthentic men not 'men of race' but 'ruins' of the former Hyperborean archetype from which they have already degraded. For example, a "dolicocephalic Western-Aryan and Nordic man" (eg. Lombard-Italian and Dane) would be a 'man of race' insofar as he adheres in his 'style' of living and adherence to the Tradition of the spiritual Solar race. Such a man of Race will model his life on action and a detachment from the veil of maya, a resistance to the current of disintegration, the corrosive waters of the cycles of time as spoken of in Evola's magnum opus "Revolt Against the Modern World"; "Ride The Tiger" and to some extent "The Doctrine of Awakening"(1943), his work on originary Buddhism.

Evola discusses the Aryan racial sub-types and their "Nordico-Western" origin. He critiques the biblical notion that civilization emanates from the near east and Mediterranean (ex orient lux) and the Darwinian mythology of a common 'African origin' which supports it and instead posits the true paleohistorical origin which is the current arctic area (ex occidente lux). He covers mainstream archaeological ground which necessitates this conclusion, an inconvenient truth for the semito-philic culture of modernity. The Aryan is the originator of civilization which bears his stamp globally in decayed remnants of subsequent mixtures and archaeological and linguistic cognates. However the "Nordico-Aryan thesis" Evola propounds "denies to any current people the right to corner or monopolize the nobility of our common origin" as there are no current Aryan sub-types who are pure or purely representative of the Hyperborean archetype.

This leads Evola to the problem of 'latinity' or the 'latin myth' which he attempts to clarify of its false historical contaminations. The popular notion of 'latin' possesses "meaning only on the aesthetic,

'humanistic' and literary planes, in the world of arts and 'culture' in the most superficial sense of the word".

This is a distortion of the proper meaning of the term. its true origins Evola proves is as a designator of "peoples whose racial and spiritual kinship with the group of the Nordico-Aryan peoples is, for every competent person, incontrovertible". he evidences this claim by asserting that "the Aryan primordial races, both the Nordico-Atlantic ones (the Franco-Cantabrian civilization of the Cro-Magnon men) and the Nordico-Scandinavian ones (the civilization of Fossum)." The Dorian migrations into the Mediterranean culminated in the Spartans who were "characterized by the cult of Apollo as solar Hyperborean god", and this is one of the originary formations of the Mediterranean Nordico-Aryan strain.

Evola further goes on to analyze the problem of latinity and how it became contaminated with "influences of italic pre-Aryan strata" and therefore culminated in degenerate Aryan civilizations of a "composite Romanity", an overlay upon the latent Aryan Romanity of Hyperborean extraction. he states emphasizing the task that in Racial Education "it is of capital importance to bring to light such divergences" a means of purifying the race of its non-Aryan dross. This is to be achieved in reconstructing the imperial mission of Aryo-Roman stock discoverable in "the customs, cults, rituals and institutions of ancient Rome".

The ideal Roman type or 'Super-Race' of Evola he delineates according to his tripartite schema of Race. Physically (the 1st degree of Race); psychologically (the 2nd degree, that of the soul) and spiritually (the 3rd degree that of the spirit). This type is outlined in terms of its essential qualities. It is "dolicephalic", has a "prominence of the forehead"; It has neither thick eyebrows nor fleshy lips, etc. Psychologically (2nd degree) its behavioral qualities and tendencies express themselves in a "greater dynamism" which is nonetheless "controlled, clear-headed" possessed of a "dominant attitude", "...with meditated resoluteness", etc. Its ethics embody the classical 'virtues' of Rome, neither "moralistic" nor "reactionary": virtus; fortitudo; constantia; sapientia; humanitas; disciplina; gravitas; dignitas; solemnitas; fides. The spiritual form of the 'super-race' embodies a "feeling of respect for the divine" yet not the "semitic servility towards the Divinity". The Roman ideal for Evola subsumes a "conscious and resolute action [which] could be considered as continuation of the divine will itself".

The task of Fascist Italy in the time of Evola is still valid for our time today. To create "an environment saturated with spiritual forces and heroic vocations, we shall reproduce the climate needed by the 'super-race', which is ours to reawaken...". The impetus of the ideas of "blood, of race" is thus necessary

to avoid the "collectivist levelling" of a quantitatively based demo-masonic dystopia. Evola says "we must see to it that race [has] a heroic and aristocratic" meaning.

Evola's curriculum vitae outlining the "fundamental principle[s] of a complete racism" is an attempt to guide the Aryan race out of the quicksand of disintegration and to a sound understanding of its life task.

It is an attempt to reorient the trajectory of the will of the Aryan in opposition to the cycles of time following the counterclockwise path of the swastika, the path of spiritual virility, of power. To purify oneself, one's racial sub-type and the Aryan race as a composite whole of the dross of accumulated decadence is the golden target. "The Elements of Racial Education" is the arrow, the bow is the race and the will the motive force.

It behooves the Aryan of today, living in the nadir of the Kali Yuga, to follow the path laid out in this didactic work of Baron Julius Evola, and to become who he still remains in germ, like Evola a man of race.

The Racial education Evola offers is a racial purity spiral exerting a centrifugal force and working against the cycles of time in a leftwards motion following the path of the swastika of the Aryan towards the center and Olympian height of Hyperborea.

Christ-Insanity Identity: Kosher or Pro-White Psyop?

Christianity will be discussed first owing to its representing the greatest enervating influence upon the consciousness of any who should fall under its spell. This notion of being subject to a mesmeric or hypnotic influence via the thought forms of christianity must be taken literally and is not a mere figure of speech. This is discussed in copious detail in the works of Joy of Satan ministries especially "Exposing Christianity".

The thought form of 'christ' has been ingrained in the consciousness of whites for two millennia and has instilled in their soul the magian morality tendencies inherent in this egregore.

The 'christ-like' behavior of this 'savior figure' has conditioned the consciousness of the white race to be that of a pacifistic (and inevitably passive aggressive as the nature of organisms is to express their will to power regardless of any 'moral prohibition') cowardly sneak, one was no capacity to be open and honest and to simply manifest his inhibited

aggression in underhanded and deviant ways, often and perhaps in most cases toward himself (masochism).

The 'christ archetype' thus functions to weaken and inhibit the natural drives; to cause them to be 'bottled up' in the pressurized canister of the self. Such a restriction of one's behavior leads of necessity to a 'generalized neuroticism' if the writer may employ a term from 'academic' psychology.

The obligation to self censor and suppress one's natural inclinations is built into christianity with its commands to "turn the other cheek" and "judge thee not". To adhere in 'sincerity' (assuming this is possible) to the moral commands of christianity is to shut down one's conscious mind and to live in a state of willful ignorance, refusing to face the harsh realities of the fact that judgment, moral evaluation of others (persons; places and things) is natural and healthy and to attempt to suppress this tendency leads to neuroses, what 'new agers' might call 'chakra blockages' or preventing the harmonious flow of the energies of one's body and soul.

To "judge thee not" is to impose upon another in the form of finger wagging prohibition that they cease to think and to express their thoughts in word or deed. The finger-wagger, the censor, she who takes upon herself to enforce these 'moral' prohibitions seeks through this means to express her will to power within socially acceptable parameters.

"Christianity is will to power in ethics" as Oswald Spengler said. The expression of its will to power is that of the Faustian soul, an aggressive imposition upon others of its own particular package of obligations; prohibitions and whatever sparse permissions it entails, it's 'morality' in short.

For those who are the priest caste of christianity this clearly serves their will to power, enabling them to accrue to themselves temporal power and all of the advantages accompanying it, namely wealth and control over others.

The function of christian will to power is thus serviceable to this caste and to they who adopt its preachments and utilize their position or identity as a christian to impose upon others there will to power: "thou shalt xyz"; "thou shalt not qrs"-these are the structures of the morality of christianity, simple and basic prohibitions and obligations.

Granted this serves its adherents in augmenting their personal power and wealth but it does so at a great disadvantage, that being the violation of their soul, its subjection or subordination to entities and its gradual merger with the hive mind structure of what the writer will call 'the Demiurge' or what the christians call 'God'.

Though this may appear 'virtuous'; desirable and agreeable, it is in fact a recipe for extinction of the soul through its absorption into 'The One' or the Demiurge and moreover, it's vampirization by the 'angelic host' or entities with whom the christian becomes bound.

Thus to all appearances viewed from the perspective of five sense reality the christian has employed the ideology of christianity as an instrument of his will to power. In reality however he has actually disempowered himself at the fundamental level of the soul through having his soul subject to disintegration through the hidden forces which absorb it into themselves.

The more 'christian' the christian, the more devoted to these ideas of christianity, the more entrained he becomes with the thought forms of christianity, the more easily he becomes possessed by these entities and the more of a hold they have over his soul.

The deception of jewish created christianity lies in its false appearance of 'kindness' and 'benevolence'. All that sickly creed purports to be what it is not and does the opposite of what it claims: it purports to help others but does so only materially and only as a means of proselytism, of 'bringing the sheep into the fold'-or rather transforming the 'goats' (non-christians) into 'sheep' (christian).

Its false gifts are trafficked in only as a hook of Mary to hook in the 'lambs of God' and they who would seek to rebel or bite at the shepherds crook let alone at the Shepherd himself are slated for slaughter by the priests of the order of Melchizedek as 'heretics' or 'infidels', the actual terminology deployed by the Catholic Church in its stigmatization of the non-catholic (however this applies equally to Protestants).

The promise of eternal life and immortality through undergoing various devotional prayers, the 'motions' of christian programming, rather than granting one this false promise instead grants one a one-way ticket to hell-fire owing to the above outlined process of entity attachment and the vampirization of the soul of the person.

This is presumably why the priestly caste wishes to have its sheep confined within their pen of the church preferably as much as possible as this facilitates the attachment of these entities and strengthens the programming. The programming disempowers the person and transitions them to the 'lake of fire' and the second death postmortem.

To hear the words and experience the relics and aesthetic pageantry of the church (be it catholic or protestant) is to immerse oneself in the atmosphere of these entities and to create a bind on the person through such associations, the person coming to view these experiences they undergo in the church as desirable and after a certain period essential, the person becoming a 'christian' and addicted to the holy water of organized christianity.

They render themselves a vessel of these entities and are thus under their influence and immersed to greater and greater degrees into the hive mind of the Demiurge and become his servants and the servants of his 'angelic host' who impel the christian to spread their religion- sell it by zealot.

Though this may not be entirely correct the writer surmises it is a fair representation of christians and the influence of christianity and their 'fate' in terms of its mechanics and influence, a faith in falsehood and false appearances and a faith that transforms one over time into a wraith like the 'ring wraiths' in J.R.R. Tolkien's work.

Joy of Satan Ministries speaks in some of their lectures of how christians over time take on a faded look, similar to Gollum who becomes enslaved by the 'Ring'-one need only observe old church ladies to see how they are of a faded complexion and this proportional to their 'devotion' to their 'faith' (wraith?).

Gollum's ring of power may be an allegorical representation of the rings of Saturn (Sauron) which, according to Norman Bergrun in his book "Ring-Makers of Saturn" are ice crystal structures created by E.T's and, according to David Icke in his presentation "The Moon-Saturn Matrix", these rings serve as a radio transceiver in transmitting certain vibrational frequencies to the earth by the artificial structure of the moon which in turn traps the inhabitants of Gaia within its electromagnetic matrix web.

The entire christian program, presumably created by jews 'from the beginning' was engineered by them in service to their 'Elohim' i.e. trans-dimensional reptilian aliens) and serves as a mechanism of keeping the population in fear and trembling, in a lower vibrational frequency state of consciousness and thus incapable of transcending the limitations of this matrix prison.

christianity is the ultimate slave program which transforms once normal beings into automata whose minds are crystallized and incapable of overcoming these limitations save with severe modification and shocking forceful influence and experiences.

The mind becomes limited to the spatio-temporal plane or dimension in spite of the claims to the contrary christianity adduces as its 'treasures in heaven'. The illusory heaven world christianity preaches is in reality a world ill-defined and merely affirmed to exist without any detailed mechanical description of its workings or how and by what process one arrives at such a destination save perhaps through the pseudo-spiritual expostulation's of its 'devotional prayers'.

These prayers are themselves simply a re-presentation of the thought forms which not only attract but which bind entities to oneself and transform one into a christian, which is to say one of the 'goyim' or cattle on the slave plantation of Zion.

Christianity, further disempowers its adherent throughout the life of the adherent having an obligation to 'work'. 'Work' means an expenditure of the life force, a dissipation of one's energies and their absorption into the entities which are bound to one through the process of church devotion (christian programming). Though one should be a 'secular (worldly) humanist' he too is bound to entities in whatever tavern he hangs around, both churches and taverns (pubs; bars- call them what you will) being run by jews in most all cases and serving to absorb the wealth of the 'goyim' into jewry through inducing addiction in their 'customers': either an addiction to holy water or two firewater.

As if this weren't bad enough, having to pay tithes and bar tabs, one must also pay with his soul, having his soul energy leeches from him by these 'angels' a.k.a. transdimensional reptilian entities with whom jewry are bound and by whom jewry are genetically hybridized with neanderthals.

Further references which suggest that christianity is a mere invention and should not be ascribed credibility or supported are here:

"christianity Exposed", Wayne Macleod

<https://www.solargeneral.org/>

"Paul of Tarsus, or christianity and Jewry", Savitri Devi

(convincingly proves christianity was created by saul/paul of tarsus and the kehilla)

<https://www.savitridevi.org/article-fowler-paul.html>

"christian Identity Crisis and the Jewish People", High Priest Jake Carlson (joyofsatan.org)

https://www.satanslibrary.org/Pdf_Library.html

"The Christ Conspiracy", Acharya S (aka. D.M.Murdoch)

(apparent afrocentric bias and affirms that Whites are in collusion with jews not as dupes in a conspiracy that is somehow favorable to Whites as a collective)

<http://www.truthbeknown.com/christ.htm>

"Exposing christianity", (joyofsatan.com)

(focuses more on catholicism than protestantism and doesn't treat of Identity. Convincingly proves christianity was/is a synthesis of pre-christian Aryan traditions similarly to "The christ Conspiracy" but less detail and no afrocentric bias)

https://www.satanslibrary.org/Exposingchristianity/EXPOSING_christianity_MAIN.html

"Hunter", William L Pierce

(discusses in fictional form how christian identity is/was created to get people out of christ-insanity)

<https://www.resist.com/Onlinebooks/Hunter.pdf>

"The Origin of christianity", Revilo P Oliver

(more of the same as the above but discusses it also from a pragmatic standpoint and its use and deleterious influence on Whites historically)

http://www.revilo-oliver.com/rpo/RPO_NewChrist/toc_ol.htm

"An Open Letter to All christians", David Lane

(claims christian identity is a psyop created by pro-whites and that it is largely ineffective and that Whites should turn to naturalism/Wotanism/'original' masonry aka. Hermeticism)

<https://www.davidlane1488.com/ltc.html>

"Jesus Never Existed", Kenneth Humphreys

(convincingly proves its title based on historical evidence archaeological and textual)

<http://www.jesusneverexisted.com/>

Though these above works approach christianity from the perspective of a more mundane and naturalistic viewpoint they raise significant points of criticism in terms of the actual historical 'reality' of christianity; its origins and the motivations of its formulators.

In more esoteric terms there may be some redeemable qualities within christianity both protestant and catholic. In the catholic church there have been assimilated much in the way of pre-christian symbolism; iconography and textual and figurative representations of metaphysical principles and cosmology.

The works "The Symbolism of The Cross" and "Insights Into Christian Esotericism" by Rene Guenon as well as the presentations of Bill Donohue give insight, as does the work "Central Sun" by Peryt Shou a German Armanist affiliated with Aleister Crowley.

This does not mean that what is called organized christianity today is spotless and pure or in any way desirable to traffic in- it simply means that what has been assimilated into it has value and thus christianity must not be viewed from a purely exoteric perspective.

Indeed to do so is to miss the point of its witchcraft as it is simply a syncretic formula of black magic concocted by jewry to enslave the 'goyim' as Nietzsche spoke of in his works though not implicating jewry as the causal agent.

To avoid the influence of this black magic witchcraft and its spread one must avoid and expose christianity for what it is and this in the most explicit way drawing upon the above sources especially those of Joy of Satan Ministries.

Failure to do so will augment the spread of christianity and will enable the dark forces to continue to enslave the earth and to reduce all to witless slave drones who cater to the whims of their masters the reptilians.

Christianity is the foremost threat to white survival and indeed to Truth and thus must be ruthlessly opposed through prudent and effective means. To speak about burning churches or executing christians simply plays to the victim- martyr complex of christians and is ineffective. An informational spread of counter propaganda against the christian program is necessary not only to deprogram the minds of its captive slaves and to liberate them but to expose it for the lie it is and to ensure that a world in which spiritual truth can banish the darkness of its lies flourishes.

ORGANICISM

The philosophy of Oswald Spengler and Francis Parker Yockey has been called "organicism" by some, a philosophy related to what they called 'cultures' which these authors posit as some sort of spiritual force or 'organism' that has a material component in the form of human populations and the cultures which they create which are epiphenomena of that population and presumably are an as it were 'emanation' of the 'culture soul' or 'cultural organism' from which they derive, as above so below.

Thus what are conventionally called 'cultures' are incarnations of the cultural soul or organism, its mundane footprints having an idiosyncratic size and shape specific to itself.

Organicism is a nebulous creed as, especially in the case of Francis Parker Yockey, it speaks of the cultural organism as not racial or a race but existing over and above the particular racial demographics such that the demographic can be molded and modified according to the qualities of this 'culture' which has a formative and causal influence on their being. This appears to be a legitimate enough conception should we concede that such an 'organism' exists which is itself a fair presumption.

However, whether this 'organism' is not necessarily bound up with certain racial groups as either an epiphenomenon of their racial soul having a causal influence in maintaining their

soul or whether it is a pre-given structure (an energetic 'spiritual' formation of a qualitatively distinct type is under). Thus what is cause and what is effect and what precedes and originates and what proceeds and is originated is a question. Perhaps either of the organicist authors speak of this in detail but the writer can't recall any specific passage wherein this was spoken of.

Thus upon reading such as Spengler and Yockey one is left with a tenuous connection between a nebulous 'culture' or 'culture soul' and the actual, biological race which exists and can be perceived in five sense reality to concretely exist is neglected. This has the effect of accommodating doubt in the reader as to whether spirit and matter are strictly conjoined and accommodates the presence of these distinct biological physical groups within the same territory as the emphasis of the organicists is the presentation of 'western culture' which term 'Western' is referred to explicitly in Spengler's title of his work "The Decline of the West".

In Yockey's work "Imperium" also the emphasis is placed on salvaging "western civilization" which could mean any number of things and as Yockey spoke favorably of the Catholic church in "The Enemy of Europe" at a certain point he may have attempted to draw parallels between Catholicism and western civilization such that it is the 'universal'/Catholic church that is being sought to be saved not the white race specifically.

Spengler however contends, regarding christianity, that it is "The Grandmother of Bolshevism" and exalts "Prussianism". Thus he would not speak favorably of christianity nor weld it together with 'the West' but in his magnum opus speaks of the West in terms (his thesis) suggestive of his willingness to see it saved from a possibly inevitable doom. Thus can be seen that the culture is not strictly bound to race so far as the writer can recall, that 'the West' is spoken of in decline and that whether it can be salvaged or not is a question.

Thus the reader of these works is left in some state of confusion as to what is being spoken of as 'the culture' and 'the West' are nebulous and ill-defined terms which admit of all manner of associations most of which are presumably false.

That Spengler was allegedly one-eighth jewish suggests that, as he was the founder of organicism, the purpose of this philosophy was to confuse the racial issue under the guise of a nebulous 'cultural' auspice which is suggested (albeit in an implicit way) to be the major ultima causa of that over which it superintends.

Thus biological race is shunted to the side and supplanted with a 'culture' organic life that can be observed on the earth being supplanted with the 'life' of the unidentifiable and at best inferable by the mundane artefacts of human culture, 'cultural organicism' as the be

all and end all, possibly accommodating non-white races in white society and even an intermixture thereof.

The way in which these ideas are presented clothed in a tone of doom, gloom and desperate necessity of struggle makes discerning any forward path difficult to properly understand and leaves the reader with a feeling of hopelessness and even apathy over the fate of 'the West', 'Western culture'.

Perhaps both Spengler and Yockey were operatives of the cabal and were merely conscripted to play the role they play-the former as a respectable bourgeois civil servant putting forth a philosophy of aggression so that the Germans could be clothed in the raiment of 'militarism' and thus blamed for the orchestrated world war that the jewish elite and their masonic affiliates contrived to establish the state of israel, the league of nations and their world government and this by creationing chaos and the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian empire.

Thus Germans become the scapegoat again and are blamed for the jews' gambit for power. Perhaps this was the motive of putting Spengler in his position and publishing his works making them highly popular in the Germany of the time?

As regards Yockey he appears on the scene as an Irish American presumably at one time (and forever?) a Catholic and apparently had a 'change of heart' or epiphany regarding the injustice of the jewish orchestrated world war two and on that basis became an opponent of that which he rightly referred to as "The Enemy of Europe", ie. the jewish shadow government in both its communist-soviet form and is zionist-capitalist form (U.S.A anglo-american empire).

This is what gave rise to the notion of the 'third position', that which is neither communist nor capitalist but has attached the somewhat nebulous label 'fascist' which simply means a government based upon order in its Italian fascist sense, a term that, like 'culture' and 'western'; could have assimilated within it any and everything from a multiracial sewer to a christian hegemony ruled by jews.

Presumably the latter is an outlier and the traditional definition of Mussolini and Gentile applies in Yockey's understanding, namely an organic state, a state that is shaped and molded by a common 'culture' or 'culture organism' and that the culture organism has become developed (or develops?) the writer does not adequately comprehend either Yockey or Spengler's position) by the population's existence in a given place over time, like a foot fitting into a shoe, the shoe becomes molded by the foot and perhaps molds the foot-for better or worse?

Thus the end conclusion regarding organicism that the writer can make is that as a general description of the modality of a racial soul it would be a valid conception, the racial soul qua 'culture' having a formative influence on the population serving to maintain a certain state of being or formation that can be considered the race of the population existing in an 'organic state'.

However it is uncertain whether Yockey or Spengler intended this to be their conception at all and thus the reader of their works is left with more questions than answers.

The fact that Yockey reached out to non-whites such as arabs, etc. for assistance in dismantling the American empire suggests that he might have had at least an effective strategy in combatting the enemy though it creates associations that the jewish police state (and the jews) want, namely to associate whites with terrorism and further it creates should any such alliances ever be formed, a high probability of having the relationship blow up in one's face. Thus one must conclude that organicism is a 'noli me tangere' and should be read simply to extract useful concepts that can be perhaps better oriented towards racial preservation.

The "Decline of the West" and the manifest destiny of the white race are confused in the works of Spengler and Yockey-the organicists- and thus what the destiny of 'the West' would be and whether this is equivalent to "the destiny of the white race" or contains it in a positive and uplifting manner or a negative and destructive one is an uncertainty. The tone of both especially that of Spengler suggest if not an inevitable decline then a necessary upward heroic striving for the salvation of the white race and in the case of Yockey it is more of a 'battle cry' than anything strategic or tactically specific.

The preservation or rectification of 'Western Civilization', the 'culture' of the west is thus portrayed as a dying cancer patient and whether this patient's condition is terminal or no is not stated in either work to be a certainty but rather an uncertainty though in both the uncertainty of its recovery seems to preponderate especially in the case of the mischling Spengler who may have been fanning the flames of war deliberately.

Thus is put forth and very discretely a near eastern fatalism that accompanies Spengler's works and the conception of culture cycles as, if they were paralleled to physical bodies subject to generation and corruption. Perhaps this may be the case but the influence and effect of the work leads more to an apathetic pessimism in the reader than any inspiration to combat the enemy and attain a victory.

Perhaps this was the intention of the work, namely to demoralize the racist white reader and lead him to the precipice of despair over the potentially 'near-inevitable' fate of his 'culture', ie. of his race and all of that which supports his being and is a creation thereof? Perhaps this is just the writer's misunderstanding of the works of the organicists?

In either case both Spengler and Yockey are used by contemporary operatives of the cabal to put forth their nebulous 'third position', to detract from the racialist standpoint and its clear and distinct blood, soul and soil emphasis and the necessity for action against the enemy; the creation of bad alliances with such as non-whites and especially muslims and with Russia, the 'eurasian-empire'; with an excessively harsh critique of Americanism without an adequate appreciation of its saving graces and the replication of the anti-nordicist agenda which is diametrically opposed to the position of the national socialists and of Julius Evola's conceptions of race as outlined in "Synthesis of Racial Doctrine".

Thus the contemporary alright nazbol Duginist figures who are all working against the intelligent white elites and even average intelligent pro-whites who value their European heritage and the productive and creative history of whites, are merely serving the jews wittingly or no in sabotaging the only hope whites have for survival namely the white intelligentsia who dwell in 'the West' without whom all civilization crumbles to dust in the iron fist of global jewish despotism whether it flies its black and red flag under the name of 'third position'; 'fascism' in its inauthentic, nebulous form, or 'national bolshevism' or variations on the theme. Whether this is an appropriate application of organicism or a construal is a question the writer cannot solve.

Emanationism: Being, "The One" ...and the Jew

The whole of the history of thought, of philosophy and of religion orients around a Divine Principle or 'One Being' that is purported to be 'God'; the Absolute; The Supreme Being; that-than-which-nothing-greater-can-exist; the Omniscient; the Omnipresent, et.al. What else could this be but the galactic center? (Peryt Shou, "The Mystery of the Central Sun").

This is a consistent idea throughout the history of conceptualizing Reality and thus must be 'reckoned with' or given credence as a potential reality. In the tradition of the Aryan in its various forms globally, from the earliest kingdom of Egypt with its Amun and Sumeria with its Enlil; through the Brahma of India and the 'Great ultimate' of Daoism-all ancient white societies have subscribed to a henotheistic conception of reality, of Being, in which the Divine Principle exists as the source of all Being if not identical with the sum total of all phenomena within the phenomenal world.

The various god forms, allegorical representations of natural forces correlated with planetary deities in most cases (astrotheology), were never the limitation of the Aryan mind which looked beyond the worldly plane towards the higher dimensions of Being and did not deny 'the world' but simply transcended it, and yet existed within it in a harmonious manner as part of the Divine.

The problem of 'God' arose with the 'fall of man', ie. with miscegenation from the former heights of consciousness of the semi-Divine Hyperboreans during the Golden Age of Hyperborea before the capture of Saturn in his bands of ice (cf. "The Ringmakers of Saturn", Norman Bergrun) to the comparative depth of consciousness that gave rise to the ever increasing involution via mixture and the decreasing vibrational frequency of the aeon to the point of the present Kali Yuga and the point of no return, to the modern 'wigger', the debased and negrified white.

What heralded the Kali Yuga was the trumpet of Zion blowing itself obnoxiously into the ears of the Aryan society through the agency of the mongrelized stock of the jew. In the near eastern understanding of Reality, of the Divine, ie. 'God', was merely a personal affair- only they could understand God owing to their 'special' properties, ill-defined and nebulous traits possessed only by themselves.

Thus they claimed and to this day claim to be the 'children of God' and this 'God' they speak of is claimed to be the Absolute; Supreme Being; that-than-which-nothing-greater-can-exist. Indeed they attempt, in their characteristically supremacistic and despotic fashion-a tendency born of their own defective and mongrelized blood which creates a paranoic fear of the unknown and a self-protectiveness that manifests itself in an egocentric self-obsession with 'safety and security'; 'protection' by a personal father figure deity called 'Yaweh'-to control the world through representing themselves as having a covenant specific to themselves with the sum total, with God. They would take God for themselves even as they are subject to God and the influence that is Him, and proclaim themselves gods in relation to Him/Her as children borne of His/Her womb.

The middle eastern madness than is the imposition of 'God' upon the sum total as mediated by his 'children' is the implied supremacistic claim made by the jews, as means of attempting to reify via this black magic their rule over the earth, their 'dominion mandate' which they claim in their arrogance to have been bestowed upon them by the absolute, scribed in their texts and penned in their own name or the earthly inheritance which was always that of the Aryan, they who were the original Race or species form whom all others emanates via mongrelization with the anthropoids and possibly even genetic engineering (cf. Blavatsky; Max Heindel; Rudolf Steiner; Hermann Weiland; Miguel Serrano, et.al).

The middle eastern madness of judaism was thus formed as a strategem for global conquest and production of all to the status of slaves who are obligated to serve the jews as will-less puppets in order to subsist in their own countries they themselves have created. The infiltration of jewry into other nations presumably always followed the same formula: infiltrate; assimilate (ostensibly); dominate; exterminate, and the elevation of the jew in white societies has always brought about the devolution of society and in many cases the

complete erasure of the history and identity of the Aryan creators either through miscegenation or through overt slaughter and rapine.

It was no different in the hellenistic period and in Rome specifically during the time the jewdeo-christian regime has assigned to 'christ', the jewish messiah figure that was presumably invented by themselves as means of softening up the Roman empire for the takeover. The figure of Philo Judaeus worked with the assistance of Julius Ceasar to introduce the judaistic hellenism he had contrived, which merged the jewish created stoicism (constructed by Zeno of Citium, a 'Phoenician', a jew) with Platonism and its variants which existed during this time. He introduced the concept of the Good vs. Evil false dichotomy, portraying Spirit as antagonistic to matter and propounding an ethics of contemplative devolution towards the Divine, resignation and a life destroying and denying death cult borne of his and his tribes' 'world fear' as mongrelized chandala who were incapable of any healthy relationship to Being, were indeed unhealthy organisms who projected out of the consciousness an unhealthy understanding-in reality of misunderstanding-of Being, of Reality at all levels and dimensions.

This is what, in conjunction with the stoicism introduced into Rome and partially Romanized or Aryanized led to neo-Platonism through the figure of Plotinus three hundred years later, an Alexandrian Egyptian mongrel who welded together the Platonism of Greece with the near eastern emanationist philosophy which derived from the mongrel stock of that region.

Following from him Porphyry, another Phoenician jew, moved the goal posts forward and as the Roman empire at the time was saturated with christian dogma presumably introduced by Saul of Tarsus it had assisted in crystallizing Rome's collective consciousness just as christianity had begun to fuse together the disparate stocks which comprised its melting pot of genetic goulash into a distilled product of near-eastern, mediterranean and Aryan elements into the contemporary stock which existed at that time.

Of course the roots of the disease of jewish theology extend even further back in time as Bill White details in his book "The Tradition of the Mother", back to the original formation of their pantheistic creed such as that of the cults of Cybele and of Dionysos, of Set and Asherah.

The origin of 'Yahweh' is written of in White's article "Yahweh Unmasked" and traces it to a syncretism of the mother goddess figure and Baal, her consort. This makes the template of jewish theology not, as most would suspect, that of a violent father deity called 'Yahweh-Jehovah' but in actuality a mother goddess, the Ain Soph Aur (boundless light of nothingness) who is the sum total of Being and who has significance in relation to what one may do in relation to her as a Baal or priestly caste intermediary of the Divine Will, a black magician utilizing the 'astral light' (the Mother) to empower themselves in relation to the

sum total, harnessing the magnetism or aether for personal empowerment and the enslavement of others, the 'laity' or foreign races considered by jews as mere 'animals and excrement' (as stated in the Babylonian Talmud).

Thus can be seen that the jews have hijacked the Supreme Being and have attempted to distort it such that all of that which is, is the creation of their androgynous Father/Mother deity and that all of that which is is thus the property of the jew, the 'world for their inheritance', by virtue of their relationship to God as the 'chosen people'.

The writer concedes his own confusion in relation to the confused syncretism of jewry and related hellenistic, neoplatonic and subsequent renditions of the conceptualization of the Absolute but he affirms that should there be any special relationship between the Absolute and any particular group on the earth it would be based upon a connection between they who exist harmoniously in relation to the Absolute and the Absolute itself.

Clearly those who exist in such a relationship to God are those who are most pure as they are most harmonious in their elements as a distinct being, all elements of their being having existed and sustained themselves organically over time and not being a mere jumbled mixture of chaotic elements, which creates a conditio of chaos and thus can never be godly. Insofar christian identity with its conception of 'broken cisterns' is correct, that only those which are relatively pure can harmonize with God, ie. can exist in a harmonious manner, which the chaotic behavior of the jew bears suggests could never apply to themselves.

Emanationism itself its not necessarily jewish and presumably has its origin in ancient Aryan Babylon (Sumeria?) though it may have its origin at any point on the globe in all Aryan religious formations. In contemporary times there are those who are often associated with the white movement who have affirmed an emanationistic conception of reality and have explicitly declared it not to be pantheistic: Giovanni Gentile, the Italian fascist, in his work "The Theory of Mind as Pure Act" formulated the philosophy of actualism and this is, so far as the writer can understand, echoed in the cosmotheism of William.L.Pierce. Both affirm a Deity though Pierce's doctrine is perhaps overly naturalistic and Gentile's presumably a variety of Catholic philosophy under a fascist label, himself having been a Catholic and having been of a comparatively swarthy mediterranean stock thus casting a shadow of foreign influence over his work.

Nonetheless it is clear that there exists a divide between a Father and Mother Deity at least subsequent to the time of 'christ' and this is expressed in the catholic priest Denis Fahey's work "The Kingdom of Christ and Organized Naturalism". It is clear that jews and freemasons are bound up in a thieves pact of their intended global government though it is unclear whether masonry has not been hijacked and distorted by jews for their own ends

though the writer suspects it has been (see the section of this work "Hermeticism/Gnosticism: Jewish or Aryan Origin?").

That most of the 'organized naturalism' of jewish occultism works in tandem with all other forms of occultism that are publicized today even that of the pro-white movement which may be controlled opposition, suggests that either the jews have completely co-opted the original Aryan occultism or that they have merely created an emanation of their own in the form of controlled opposition, all of the pantheistic subsects of prowhite philosophy such as David Lane's naturalism and Ben Klassen's Creativity movement to The Joy of Satan ministries, etc. The tangled skein of the gordian knot of philosophy and esotericism is difficult to unravel and the writer awaits answers that he cannot himself provide.

Esoteric Hitlerism: Hitler, The Last Avatar and Manu, the Man to Come

Miguel Serrano, Chilean diplomat and initiate brought into the world a doctrine of national socialist gnosticism which he called "Esoteric Hitlerism" a doctrine which contains the template for an awakening of the Aryan and the immortalization of the soul. His doctrine is that of the left hand path, the path of the swastika, a return to flirt Hyperborea, the aeonic condition of Eternity which he calls the Green Ray, the vibrational level beyond physicality, what in christian esotericism was called the 'nunc stans' or Eternal Now.

The project of Serrano is the liberation of the Aion Saturn and the Earth (Gerda) from the matrix of the Demiurge and this through the transmutation of the base metal of the now wiggerized white race in its involuted form of dross into the philosophical gold of the Absolute personality, the immortalization of the soul through an increase of its vibrational frequency and through a "synchronistic gathering of the specific and correct particles" (Maya, "Reality is an Illusion", pg.4) of the body and soul, a spiritualization of the material and this not as an isolated individual but himself as an element of his racial soul.

The project is a daunting one and only the Hero (Virya) can resurrect his soul from the increasing density of the Demiurge in the age of lead or Kali Yuga. He then can call out to Kalki avatara and Wotan and his Wildes Heer, his last Battalion of Einherjer, of warriors and conquer the enemy on earth as well as in the heavens.

The battle lines are clear: on the one hand there are the pure, they who are the descendants of the white gods who alone are capable of immortality and have one foot in heaven and the other in hell, the hell of this matricized earth plane, the captive Gerda, and against them on the other side the dark forces of Jehovah and the Demiurge with their "galactic and planetary legions" ("Adolf Hitler, Last Avatar", pg. 820).

These emissaries of darkness above or below the earth Serrano does not speak of in much detail but it is reasonable to infer that they are what have been called the 'asuras' in the vedic mythos and 'djinn' in Islam, the astral parasite demonic forces which have been portrayed in the fiction of J.R.R.Tolkien as nazgul and in Carlos Casteneda as 'mud shadows', also in H.P.Lovecraft and other horror of the time of fin de siecle. These beings who have been called "the Hypostases of the Archons" in gnostic literature presumably dwell in or have a connection to the planet Saturn.

According to Serrano "Jehovah is a projection of the Demiurge or Demon, superimposed on Saturn, a supplanting of the Aion, a Doppelganger, a double, a copy, a palimpsest, an adulteration" ("Manu, For the Man to Come", pg.178), a "cybernetic monster" (ibid, pg.179).

The Demiurge thus imposes Jehovah-Satan on Saturn and "extracts energy" (ibid.) from this imprisoned Aion "to maintain the Eternal return" (ibid.). The video and photographic footage of the poles of Saturn real that it is indeed a mobile structure on that its poles are vortices of energy that are presumably imposed by the Demiurge, by the Big Bang, upon the Aion as means of transforming it into a machine that can absorb the soul energy of those who fail to cultivate the diamond-thunderbolt body of immortal vajra, the Absolute personality through the alchemical process of vajrayana, tantric maithuna. Those who fail of this project will be absorbed into Saturn in the seventh heaven and their soul energy will be used to power the dark forces and their matrix, further increasing entropy and bringing about the destruction of all.

Serrano posits over and against this gradual extinction of the soul and its 'going to god', to Jehovah the dark lord (Sauron), the "Absolute Self" as means of overcoming this fate and the gradual weakening of the soul through the cycles of incarnation. The christian religion especially he posits as a black magic formula for the capturing of the soul by Jehovah and his earthly emissaries the jews which entails a deliberate avoidance of all that which conduces to Spiritual development, the formula of Saul of Tarsus and the rabbinate for the subjugation of Rome imposing upon it as the Demiurge imposed Jehovah upon Saturn, the Catholic church. This was done so that the dark forces could absorb the wealth of nations into themselves and encourage the masses to 'be fruitful and multiply' so that they could be exploited for their energy (labor) on the earth by the jews and have their souls vampirized by the demons with whom they work. The remnant of their soul would then be transmitted to Saturn as it flees the earth ascending to the seventh heaven into the vortex of Jehovah should it not have the power of resistance necessary to reincarnate on the earth or attain the diamond-thunderbolt body.

Thus the battle lines are drawn between ROMA (the church of Rome, of the jewdeo-christian conspiracy, in which the jews play the role of rogue rebel against their own deity and the christian as humble servants of this deity forever seeking the salvation of the jews) and AMOR, the inverse of the spiritual darkness of christianity, the alchemical transmutation of the personality into the Absolute personality of immortal vajra (the attainment of the rubedo phase of the Ars Regia or royal art) through kundalini and tantra yoga, the integration of the opposite aspect of one's personality into oneself.

The reactivation of the right hemisphere of mind enables the "materialization of the astral body" which is the Resurrection of the Hero (Virya). This process is no cowardly resignation or contemplative life of 'devotion' (bhakti, 'amor intellectualis dei') to 'God' (the Demiurge and Jehovah) but rather it is the life of Spiritual virility, the upwards path towards the Olympian heights of the immortals. The music of Bach and Mozart, the magic and poetry of the Aryan initiates-this in conjunction with a life of bodily and spiritual purity are the path towards immortality and the spiritualization of the world and an overcoming of the dark age of the matrix of ROMA, both in its christian and in its communist forms.

The jews are the foremost adversary (Yahudi-shaitan, the adversary of God) of the white gods on the earth and formulate their black magic curse of christianity as mechanism of mind control to trap the white gods in their matrix prison and to attempt an extinction of the 'litr godi', the light of the gods.

According to Serrano the jew is a "cybernetic machine, a robotic mechanism connected to a battery or power source that he himself helps to feed and that he calls Jehovah". This is done through the absorption of the soul energy of the white gods (litr godi) into themselves through the incantations of the church and the perpetual abuse and imposition of stress upon the white population by the jews in the form of coerced slavery (labora), coerced prayer (ora), the transmission of their thought energy to the dark forces and the fear and terror, the black magic of the christian religion which has been imposed upon the white population from its inception.

The jews are inherently diabolical and only those who have the highest purity of Aryan blood can be saved at best, Serrano contends. Nonetheless he qualifies, "...mixing with jews cannot benefit non-jews in any way. One way or another, the jew will never be free from control, direct or remotely by means of 'telepathic biology' by this 'genetic psychotronics' of the rabbis who enslave their own population and who are themselves controlled by Jehovah as a puppet on electromagnetic strings controlling puppet underlings underneath themselves.

Serrano's conclusion regarding the jews and their tyranny and enslavement of the earth, of Saturn and of the white gods would for many attracted to the material world sound bleak and a future that is no future but rather inevitable destruction. According to his understanding it is the idea of Esoteric Hitlerism, that of the last avatar of Vishnu Adolf (wolf) Hitler, he in whom the avatar incarnated and took power to overthrow ROMA, the dark forces and the old ideas of the Piscean age that has already defeated the dark forces as Hitler won in the spiritual planes with the Idea of AMOR, of love that is not expressed through physical organs of sex and thus we are simply awaiting Ragnarokr, "the twilight of the gods, with Eternal return" ("Manu, for the Man to Come", pg. 286) and, "[i]n solidarity with the Resurrection of the Hero and with the fulfillment of the archetypal Number of liberated Viras, the Einherjer, the Earth shall herself be transfigured, mutating herself, regenerating herself" (ibid.). And thus the "Aion Kronos-Saturn-Satan" will have won and be redeemed, "the Fenrir wolf [Time] will also

devour the Jew, Jehovah and the Demiurge...when the Jew thinks it has won, seizing power over the earth, the liberated Aion, the soul of the Earth, will destroy it. Disintegrating its Demiurgic matter...only the Resurrected Hero shall remain beyond the stars..."

Thus Serrano foresees the impossibility of attaining any earthly victory for the white race and places all hope for their redemption in alchemy. Perhaps Serrano was an agent just as were Yockey and Spengler putting forth a doctrine of resignation and escapism? It seems doubtful as he claimed that fighting against the enemy and combat was an essential task, an Aryan duty and thus we cannot charge him with this. Nonetheless the impression left upon the reader of his works is that of apathy, of inevitability of the Fenris' wolf engulfing all material life in his jaws as the cycles of time come to a close. Ragnarok will not be helped through cowardly resignation nor escaped from, however inevitable it may be, and the white race will not attain Resurrection through cowardly escapism.

Thus Serrano would assist the white race in spite of the desperation of the age of lead and assists in orienting them along their proper path towards the green ray through the black sun of individuation (kaivalya) overcoming the Demiurgic rational consciousness of the yellow sun of mind. The reawakening of "the submerged continent of Atlantis, Restored Hyperborea, discovering the entrance to the interior hollow earth" (ibid. pg. 260) means a reactivation of "the thunderbolt force emanating from the third eye", the pineal gland, which he speaks of as bearing the name "kurm, supreme will, shudibudhishvabhava" (ibid.). This is the 'sieg thunderbolt', 'the Graal' or Graal light' (ibid.). Reawakening the third eye leads the Aryan back to the state of the Divyas and to the spiritualization of the material body.

"The Hero must march over the razor's edge, conquering physical sex and overcoming rationalist thought, before he can reach the submerged continent of Atlantis, Restored Hyperborea". This is the project of Serrano and of all Aryan initiates and must become the project of all whites in order to overcome the state of lead they are now subject to as a Divine Spark trapped within the zion matrix of ROMA and to transform themselves and their people even as they combat the enemy.

Whether Serrano's conceptions have a basis in fact as regards Hitler being an avatar and the inevitability of the destruction of our world as a material structure is questionable. Much of the writings of Serrano are related to the gnostic-luciferian ideology of Mani the manicurean, of a dualistic Spirit vs. Matter conception, of a denigration of rational intellectual thought (left brain) and an overemphasis on right brain consciousness.

Perhaps his intention was to take the already destabilized mind of the children of the Kali Yuga, the wiggerized 'Z.I.O.N' (zombie installation operating negatively), the "robots of the Demiurge" (ibid.) that must have become and attempt to emphasize the modality of consciousness necessary for a transmutation of the consciousness through a balanced integration of opposites? That the world of ROMA, the jewdeo-christian world, emphasizes a rationalist-materialist modality of consciousness juxtaposed with that of an emotionalism tied to the lower drives creates the useful functional slave robot of the jew world order that is a serviceable tool of jewry in its enslavement of the earth in the

matrix prison of zion.

However to simply cast aside reason is of no use in fighting the dark forces of the world and reason is in fact essential as a tool in one's arsenal against the enemy in to tactical engagement with the enemy and overcoming all of his many traps and stumbling blocks. This may not be what Serrano is contending but it leaves this impression upon the reader and may be valuable to emphasize, but a holistic consciousness necessitates an incorporation of all modalities of consciousness, of all faculties both reason and the suprarational intuition propounded in Serrano's works.

The messianism of jewry is also implicit in Serrano's works though perhaps it is not jewry's messianism at all but rather that of the Aryan, of Kalki Avatara not Jesus ben Panthera or Jehosua Hamaschiach, et.al? Perhaps the doom and gloom of the apocalypse of christianism of ROMA was also inherent in the mythos of the Aryan and the cycles of time? Only the jew, an arche plagiarist hijacked these ideas and attempted to pervert them to serve his own ends of global supremacy? Perhaps the attempt to render linear the cyclicism of time was the jews own attempt at cheating God and salvaging themselves from their inevitable doom, not being a Virya who can Resurrect?

Be that as it may Serrano's work is rather christian in some of its symbolism such as the reference to 'Kristos-Lucifer-Wotan', the 'christ' archetype (man perfected? the messiah? The return of the central sun or black sun at the bottom of the cycles of time?). The notion of history as cyclical or as linear being an inevitable progression towards destruction and a rebirth in a spiritually elevated state is inherent in the Aryan mythos and undoubtedly has its counterpart in Cosmic Law, the Divine Will if it could be spoken of in those terms (the Will of the Demiurge?).

The works of Serrano contain much in the way of detailed historical evidence and speculation not easily discoverable everywhere and for that reason are worthy of notetaking. The occult Green language of his writings are a veil not easily penetrated and yet behind that veil is concealed gnosis which must be implemented and understood by the aspiring Aryan to overcome his wiggerized state of involution. Serrano is an esotericist philosopher poet for modern times who may serve as a guide along the yellow brick road (philosophical gold brick road) towards the emerald city of the Green Ray, the 'nunc stans', the Eternal Now, of Eternia and beyond the world of transient illusion.

Radical Object: the necro-ontology of Dark Enlightenment (Negarestani's philosophy)

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Today, as promised, I will be discussing Reza Negarestani, one of the most fashionable contemporary authors and representatives of speculative realism and contributor to the journal *Collapse*, an initiative in which some of the most vivid representatives of post-humanism, post-human thinking, post-human philosophy are participating, particularly Nick Land.

For quite some time many thought that Negarestani was a pseudonym of Land, but then he appeared in public and was revealed to be a young thinker of Iranian origin. His *Cyclonopedia* is currently being translated into Russian, and I also recently gave an interview about Negarestani.

At any rate, for me Negarestani is an extremely interesting thinker. I think he ought to be studied.

When I became acquainted with his work, I had a similar feeling to when in the 1980s-'90s I encountered the status of geopolitics as a discipline in the international expert community. I discovered geopolitics by way of Karl Haushofer and the works of the Conservative Revolution and I thought that geopolitics is a kind of politically incorrect doctrine which is greatly explanatory and of great use to us, to Russia. In my eyes, I thought that geopolitics has the status of something past, something prohibited, something politically incorrect - and I liked that. But then when open sources became more accessible I gradually discovered to my surprise that geopolitics is not only the German school of Haushofer, "historically cursed and spit upon", but is also the ideological model upon which American foreign policy strategy is based. It turned out that geopolitics since Mackinder has lived on in America, as the center shifted from England to the US, and ever since Mackinder's time in the 1920s-30s geopolitics has been developed extensively in America and its status, in the very least in the analysis of international situations, has become a kind of common ground. Any representative of the Western or American elite who deals with strategic issues perfectly knows geopolitics and, moreover, is guided by such.

Thus, two sides formed: non-conformist geopolitics, which insists on the interests of Land, land civilization, and Tradition - as described by Carl Schmitt and the Russian Eurasianists, hence Eurasian geopolitics; and Atlanticist geopolitics, such as that of Brzezinski, which sees the same map, the same chessboard, only through Atlanticist eyes.

These avant-garde upgrades of geopolitics - Eurasian and Atlanticist - are dealing with completely the same reality and are playing against each other. As Brzezinski said when I asked him whether chess - and as follows the chessboard of geopolitics - is a game for two, he said no, it is a game for one - just as he played it for one, for the Atlanticists - with no one, not me, not Russia, nor China on the other side. Globalist geopolitics is when the West begins to win and to make moves with its own hand on the other side of the chessboard.

But this is not even the principal point. No matter whether there is one or two players, there are two opposing sides, black and white, there are the rules of the game, and the geopolitical map is identical.

When I became acquainted with Negarestani's works, especially in the context of speculative realism, I saw a very interesting symmetry. He and I are describing the same reality. Both speculative realists and Traditionalists, of whom I am one, are dealing with the same map of ontology, being, history, and the philosophical process. Just as how Brzezinski and I spoke about the same thing in the same language, but belonged to and played for different armies, we both agreed that we are playing chess, not hockey or a fist-fight. Chess is chess, not basketball or volleyball.

When you read Negarestani, you understand that this is strictly same reality that Guénon, Eliade, Eranos, Heidegger, Evola, and Traditionalists, or the Russian Orthodox Elders when they speak of the world of the Antichrist, had in mind. Earlier I thought that our descriptions of reality were never on the same end. For instance, those playing against us on the Globalists' end, they'll never accept this - they'll pretend that we are delusional, daydreaming, that our terminologies and descriptions are absolutely inappropriate, that we've either gotten lost in the dark Middle Ages or simply gone mad.

Our Traditionalist model sees the world as opened from the bottom. Guénon had the idea that the society of Tradition is the opening of the world egg from above, where the spirit of the transcendental principle penetrates the world. In the era of materialism and modernity, the world egg is closed to these energies. Then the world egg is open to the bottom, and the world is penetrated by the Gogs and Magogs, the sub-corporeal entities which create the civilization of the Antichrist. According to Guénon, the opening of the world egg from the bottom is the final stage of the cycle. Thusly also thought Evola, Russian Orthodox eschatologists, and the Elders - that the coming of the Antichrist is the demonic invasion of the world. This is the position of Traditionalists.

Our opponents who adhere to rationalist science laugh at such a religious or metaphysical analysis of the situation. They will never take us seriously.

Yet now speculative realism, Reza Negarestani and his *Cyclonopedia* come onto the scene, and we see a map which might as well be our own, describing how modern capitalism, progress, and technology mean the destruction of mankind, the murder of mankind, and the descent into the world of demonic, infernal forces which live off of the extraction of oil, like the blood of the Titans - Ichor, the black substance, the organism that gives birth to objects. For Negarestani, the earth is a sub-human, sub-corporeal object at the center of which is a demon. This demon strives to break out, to attack, and to seize the sun. In order to awake this demon, Negarestani says, our civilization engages in the extraction of oil and the drilling of a tunnel for this demon. Oil is the first manifestation; the second, more terrifying phenomenon is gas. The core, which Negarestani calls the flesh of a dead god, tries to be brought up to the surface. The prototypes of such were the Babylonian plague gods, which strive to enter and to devour humanity, just as humans devour a chicken from the supermarket or a salad. These plague gods, infernal powers which have been dormant for some time underground, are now emerging by means of technology to eat mankind. Just as humans devour others, so do these gods seek to live off of eating humans. They are the beneficiaries of humanity as food.

This is the advanced interpretation of open society of Soros. According to Negarestani, the "open society" is a "butchered society". It is like a chicken which is gutted for being cooked. This "gutted chicken" is humanity being prepared for the gods of plague in the post-modern era. These plague gods are specific post-human or sub-human entities. Negarestani compares them to Lovecraft's "idiot gods" in the likes of Nyarlathotep, a figure from one of his dark fantasies.

Here we end up with a picture of what is virtually an Aristotelian world inverted. According to Aristotle, the world under the moon consists of two spheres: fire and air which strive upwards, and the two spheres of the elements of water and earth which are downwards. This pyramid is inverted: on top is earth, then water - the rivers of Hell which Negarestani interprets as streams of oil, then there is gas which is underground air, and in the center is the infernal, devilish fire that is the corpse of god, in Negarestani's account of Ahriman. The latter strives to reach the surface and move through humanity, through machines and through demonic infiltrations, to capture the sun.

This hyper-mad picture is reminiscent of horror movies or fantasy novels, but nevertheless is extremely consonant with the Traditionalist view. Traditionalists believe that the devil is a metaphysical reality, that the Antichrist will come, and that modern civilization with its materialism, atheism, skepticism, and rationalism serves such demonic ends. Negarestani essentially confirms that this is how things are. Thus,

on the end of speculative realism and object-oriented ontology, and for nihilists such as one of the central characters of this speculative ontology, Ray Brassier, there are those who see things the same way as we do. But they stand on the side of this process, they want to accelerate it, such as how Nick Land speaks of accelerationism. This acceleration of the onset of demonic reality is what progress, time, and civilization are heading towards. People will gradually be replaced by post-human entities, machines, cyborgs, and new forms of being and life.

Necrosis as the form of dying will become the only substance of reality. We talked about this in the previous Expertise on object-oriented ontology, where the object lives at the expense of not the death of Dasein, but the dying of Dasein. This is a kind of paraphrase of Heraclitus formula to the effect of "The Gods live by the death of people." The object lives by the death - or rather dying - of man. In line with this necrosis, Negarestani presents the horrifying example of the "corpse sentence", in which a living man is sentenced to become a dying man. He dies very slowly; he starts dying while living. And this process of dying during life, this sentence to being a corpse, is presented as being the worst state, as the person loses perception of the differences between death and life. He can't understand whether he is alive or dead. This is one of the most eerie sentences.

Our humanity or subjectivity is condemned to this corpse. This dying is progress. For Nick Land, this is "dark enlightenment." It is part of the development of technology, new genetic studies, Silicon Valley, computer technology, and virtual simulation. Welcome to a genuine description of the delightful future of 3D printers and robots which build homes and defend borders! This is the future which delights the technocratic part of the Russian government and Western society.

It is curious that Negarestani is an open Satanist. If he were a Christian Satanist, things would have been more predictable. But he is an Iranian Satanist. In my opinion, this adds a certain credibility. He is a supporter of Ahriman, not Satan as in our cultural understanding. To be a representative of Ahrimanic reality against Ahura Mazda means approaching the archaic roots of the dark element, which is perhaps convincing. Negarestani's tale itself is very consistent, interesting, and detailed.

Before, I've mentioned Petr Lutsik's film *The Outskirts*, which shows the demonic role of oil in the Russian economy and how the oil magnates of Russian society have their own form of religion or cult. This is substantiated by Negarestani.

I agree, this is absolute nonsense. On the other hand, if this was some kind of science fiction, it would be only nonsense, only an indirect scenario. But the matter at hand here is philosophy and a philosophical

trend. Negarestani has received good assessments of his works from many object-oriented ontologists, because he is genuinely seeking words for the language of objects. These objects, which today in speculative realism are starting to speak for themselves and increasingly manifest themselves alongside the development of artificial intellect, should have their own intellect. This is a very practical matter. The technological studies of Elon Musk or Kurzweil are moving in parallel to object-oriented ontology. Such is the philosophical substantiation of the technological roar in the direction of post-human entities for which death is impossible.

Immortality and artificial intelligence are not technological problems, but philosophical problems. The philosophers of speculative realism are preparing for this knock on our door. Negarestani himself is perhaps pursuing this question of dark enlightenment in its most colorful form. Here we can see how the optimistic agenda of humanists and the Open Society is abandoned. The “open society” is a gutted, eviscerated society, the society of rippers - just as how Soros with his Open Society earlier claimed to represent “humanitarian” operations, i.e., the donating of goods or grants, but today is only a sadist destroying society. It is a representation of the infernal, underground society. Our attitude towards resources, gas, and oil thus move from an economic to a totalitarian, increasingly sinister character.

Dark Enlightenment, based on the active acceptance of nihilism with a view towards destroying and extinguishing what is human, is the new ideology of the most philosophically advanced global elites. It is not an extravagant instance of marginals. It is the mainstream following progressive, liberal, and even post-liberal philosophy.

In my point of view, Negastarani, Nick Land, and Dark Enlightenment as a whole - all of this is the real roadmap of the Globalists.

The Globalists might appear to be looking for some kind of increased living standards and opportunities for people in a world without borders, new destinies for migrants happily moving without documents to foreign territories, but this story, this narrative of the earlier, rosy Open Society and early liberalism is only for the news. The most foundational, responsible, and realistic thinkers of speculative realism have already arrived at a different agenda. Their commentaries, criteria, terms, and projects are much closer to this active demonic nihilism. Here we can recall Friedrich Georg Junger's words that where there are no gods, there are titans. There is no void. Where there are no angels, there are beasts. If we close the world egg on the top, we open it from the bottom. If we refuse God, the Devil comes. Man doesn't come, as man can only stand so much in place without God. It turns out that the one who nudged man to kill God was not man himself, not of his own will, but rather the one standing behind him who, according to skepticism and rationalism, isn't supposed to exist. The Devil pushed man to assert that

there is no God, that there is only the material world, and now he is saying: "Greetings, my dear, you have done what I requested. It is I, I am Reza Negarestani, I am object-oriented ontology, I am progress, I am the 3D printer, now I will print you and your offspring, and everything will be well." Gradually, humanity will be "packaged" in the supermarket of dark enlightenment.

Supporters of object-oriented ontology call for taking satisfaction in this process, re-conceptualizing necrosis, extinguishing Dasein, taking the latter to be a source, albeit temporary, of a certain form of survival. Degradation thus becomes a form of survival, and deformation a form of leveling of the balance between life and death, a new strategy for creating an eternity of decaying. No one has anywhere to go. The future is dark, but their proposal is to make the transition towards this darkness from the final rays of the waning evening into something eternal, or to stretch it out as long as possible. This is the program of modern globalism.

No one will be tempted or intimidated. Rather, everyone will simply be proposed to enjoy the process of eternal dying.

RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AND INITIATION

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 8 of *Mysteries of Eurasia* (1991 edition) / Essay #6 from *The End of the World: Eschatology and Tradition* (Moscow, Arktogetya: 1997) / Essay #5 from *Sweet Angel* (Moscow, Arktogetya: 2000)

Religion and Initiation according to Guenon

According to Guenon, Tradition (the entirety of sacred knowledge dating back to the primordial and inhuman divine source) has, in the final period of our cycle – the Kali Yuga, which has already been counting down for several millennia – been divided into two parts: exotericism and esotericism. Exotericism can manifest itself in the form of religion (Judaism, Christianity, Islam) or in a non-religious form (Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism, etc.) and represents the socio-psychological, ordering aspect of Tradition, i.e., the face of Tradition oriented exclusively outwards toward people and made available to all members of traditional society without exception. Esotericism, for its part, is the purely spiritual sphere. On this level, Tradition appeals to the “elite” and the “chosen” who have been called to go deep into sacred doctrines and myths. Esotericism is the underside of Tradition, while exotericism remains the outer side.

Religious society conventionally has two types of rituals intended for the induction of the neophyte into the bosom of the Sacred. The first is acceptance into an exoteric organization (“conversion”) and the second is initiation, this time into an esoteric organization. Initiation is the foundation of esotericism, and in certain cases it can be constructed not only as a ritual, but also a complex of associated esoteric and symbolic doctrines, or even as a manifestation of concrete spiritual influences exceeding the scope of the outer, exoteric tradition.

According to Guenon, the existence of precisely such a dual structure in traditional society is a necessary condition for any society to be considered normal and fully-fledged.

The uniqueness of Christianity

Such a schematic presentation, however, requires special explanation in regards to the Christian religion. Guenon believed that the Christian tradition, unlike Judaism and Islam, was originally incomplete, possessing only an esoteric and initiatic level. As evidence of this is cited the absence of a consideration in the New Testament of any legal or social dimension which constitutes the essence of any exotericism. Only in later eras did Christianity “descend” to the exoteric level in adopting the socio-religious basis of a revised code of Roman law. This original and essential esotericism of the Christian tradition should be borne in mind in order to understand further considerations.

The Shiite problem through the lens of Henry Corbin

The image of Tradition divided into internal and external spheres is particularly inapplicable in the special case of Shiism in the Islamic tradition. The most authoritative Western scholar of Islam, Henry Corbin, pointed out this very interesting feature of Iranian Islam, which is by and large Shiite. On the one hand, Shiite Islam is replete with numerous explicit references to esotericism and the foundation of Shiite doctrine particularly rests on the recognition of the central place of the “light of the Imamate” and the sacred mission of Ali, the first of the imams whose figure corresponds to the deeply esoteric level of the Muslim religion. On the other hand, “Sufi” initiatic organizations are least widespread of all in Shiism. Corbin asserts that Shiite Sufism is a rare encounter and, thus, Shiite Islam does not comply with the norm of the strict division of tradition into external and internal planes as is the case in Sunni Islam. Guenon himself, however, recognized that Iranian Islam was a special phenomenon and he associated its absence of bans on the depiction of humans or animals in sacred art (such bans are strictly observed in Sunni Islam) with the specific Aryan origin of the Iranians who, in comparison to Semites, are much less inclined toward idolatry.

In Shiism, and particularly in Iranian Shiism, we are thus dealing with an esoteric tradition more open and less formalized or institutionalized than at-Tasawwuf and Sufism. In the case of extreme Shiism (“Islamism”) this is totally evident given the virtual absence of any exotericism at all.

It should also be noted that the Iranians occupy the more “eastern” geographical and intellectual regions of the Islamic Umma, or in more general terms the Caliphate (let us recall the “Oriental Theosophy” of Suhrawardi).

Orthodoxy and the East

Taking the above-mentioned into account, an analogy can be suggested between Catholicism and Sunnism on the one hand and Orthodoxy and Shiism on the other. Firstly, unlike in Catholicism, it is practically impossible to record any special esoteric organizations in the history of the Eastern Church, whether hermetic orders, companionships, or gnostic brotherhoods. Despite their absence, however, the esoteric underpinnings of Orthodoxy can be clearly traced and are evident in the sacred architecture of churches, initiatic iconography, and a widespread apophatic theology (which was practically erased by exoteric Catholicism with the introduction of the dogma of the Filioque)[1], as well as in the monastic contemplative practices in Hesychasm, the Old Believers, and the traditions of the Holy Fools, etc.

Secondly, Orthodoxy never evolved into a purely social religion, but remained above this level. The Orthodox Patriarch, unlike the Pope, is first and foremost the spiritual center of the Church, and who does not directly influence public and political life. The social role of the Roman Pope was indeed the subject of severe criticism of Catholicism expressed by the Orthodox. It can be said that this “descent” of Christianity into society which existed in the West never happened in the East. In some sense, the “Ghibelline archetype” was realized in Russia with the Sacred Emperor as the center of the state and the Patriarch fulfilling strictly sacred functions [2].

Thirdly, this “Ghibelline archetype” mentioned above was embodied in the sacred attitude towards the Russian Tsars. It was the Tsar who was the sacred center of the Russian imperial ecumene in whose figure were concentrated all of the immanent religious energies of the [empire’s] peoples. Unlike Catholic eschatology, in which the “anti-Pope” and the usurpation of the throne of St. Peter are discussed in an apocalyptic sense, Orthodox prophecies never mentioned an “anti-Patriarch.” Instead, all negative, counter-sacred forces are gathered in the singular personage of the “anti-Tsar,” the “Antichrist-Emperor.” In principle, this “Ghibelline” aspect is typologically close to the Shiite understanding of the sacred nature of Authority, as Shiite doctrine (unlike Sunni) insists on the rule of only the Aliites, the sacred descendants of the first of the Imams. The Shiites believe that no-one outside of this line has any “sacred” or “initiatic” right to rule.

Fourthly, the eastern geographical location of Russian Orthodoxy logically puts it in close proximity to the lines of the eastern fathers, i.e., the saintly fathers from Greece, Anatolia, Syria, Lebanon, Cappadocia, etc.

Fifthly, the tradition of “Hesychasm”, or “light gnosis” from the first anchorites and the Athos monastery was not the product of some kind of formal organization within the framework of Russian Orthodoxy. Hesychasm literally permeates the Orthodox tradition all the way to the point of its extern aspects. Of course, the division between internal and external aspects remained, but there have never existed any

structural differences between the Hesychasts and Old Believers on the one hand, and the clergy and believers on the other. This differs from the strict organization of initiatic orders in Catholicism, where this border is clearly marked.

Sixthly and finally, the esoteric specificity of Orthodoxy has been preserved in Church ritual itself and particularly in the presence of iconostasis [3] which separates the altar of the Sacrament from the laity. Catholic ritual involves the openness of the altar, its accessibility to viewing by all the laity at any time during service and outside of it. Thus, the sacrament of the altar is genuinely exoteric and “descends” to the outer level. In Orthodoxy, however, the gates of Iconostasis – the Royal Gates – are open only for a short period during the key moments of the liturgy (the exception being on certain holidays). This symbolizes the unique revelation of the apophatic, unknowable Principle on the other side of the cataphatic vision of the sacred world which in a normal state is presented only by symbols – the images of iconostasis, the Deesis near, etc., as if they replace the altar. This unique feature of Orthodox ritual is connected to the historical absence of a developed “scholastic” and rational theological tradition in Russia, as theology itself in the Orthodox Church relates to the initiatic and super-rational level, whereas the openness of the altar in the Catholic Church relates the sacrament to the sphere of the rational and dogmatic. When the Catholic believer is in search of initiation, he must to appeal to special non-church authorities (esoteric communities, brotherhoods, associations, etc.), but the Orthodox can attain such as desired in the liturgy itself and enter into the most profound transcendent dimension without the aid of other sacred institutions.

Thus, it should be grasped that the Orthodox Church, similarly to the Shiite trend in Islam, is not subject to the strict division into exoteric and esoteric levels, this being true at least on the level of its archetypal organization of the sacred system. However, this does not mean that all of Orthodoxy is esoteric or that all the Orthodox are esotericists. Without a doubt, the division of “internal” and “external” planes is maintained in Orthodoxy as it is everywhere else depending on the personal qualities and “spiritual caste” of this or that human being. However, in our case, this division is not formalized, and the degree of initiatic quality depends exclusively on the internal nature of the believer and his efforts to realize his given spiritual possibilities.

Of course, the degree of spiritual realization strictly corresponding to the general structure of the initiatic sphere is preserved in Orthodoxy, but its character is more flexibly and less structured than it is in closed esoteric organizations.

The question of “virtual initiation”

Speaking of initiation, Guenon distinguished between “virtual initiation” and “effective” or “realized” initiation. From his point of view, the Christian religion, since becoming “exoteric,” cannot offer any sort of “initiation.” In Catholic ritual and in the Catholic sacrament, purely spiritual energies of the same nature as in initiatic rituals are also in action, but they are not oriented towards perfect interiorization and, consequently, affect only the outer side of the individual structure of believers. “Salvation” is guaranteed, but the path to higher, super-individual levels of existence is not opened as happens in purely esoteric mysteries.

However, an initiation received by means of esotericism might remain a forever “virtual,” untapped possibility if there is a lack of knowledge of the secrets of the “initiatic work,” the “Great Work,” or if the “dedicated” prefers to use the “wealth” attained for goals opposite to the great goal of spiritual exaltation and the realization of purely heavenly, spiritual states.

Orthodox Initiation

Building on the particularities of the Orthodox Tradition and basing oneself on the typological parallel with the Shiite tradition, an extremely important conclusion can be drawn: Orthodoxy is an operative instrument for transferring “virtual initiation.” Thus, Orthodox ritual itself, unlike Catholic ritual, preserves an initiatic character peculiar to original Christianity.

On the symbolic level, the Church of St. Andrew the First-Called – the Orthodox Church – never fully separated itself from the esoteric Church of St. John, as happened in the case of the Church of St. Peter.

In addition, the Medieval legend of “the Kingdom of Prester John” located somewhere in the East, can be symbolically related not only to the main sacred center of the Primordial Tradition, but also by analogy to Russia itself where, in fact, “John” (Ivan, Ioan) has always been the most widespread name.

This particularity and uniqueness of Russian Orthodoxy has its doctrinal reflection in the Orthodox “Formula of Faith,” in which the rejection of the Catholic innovation of the “Filioque” – i.e., the assertion that the Holy Spirit comes not only from the Father, the First Entity of the Trinity, but also from the Son, the Second Entity – bears the character of a rejection of “mediating” entities between the sacred, spiritual Cosmos (the “Holy Spirit”) and the Genesis. In other words, it rejects exotericism as a mediating force between the believer and initiation. The omnipresence of the Holy Spirit and its direct link to the Father, along with the apophatic hypostasis of the Trinity, means a direct totality of the “Spiritual Light”

accessible to the Orthodox which permeates Being in every sense and opens the initiatic “dispensation” in Orthodox life. This Orthodox principle of “divine dispensation” [literally “house-building” in Russian – J.A.], which is central to the entire Eastern Church and its practices, precisely corresponds to the “church-dispensation” [literally “church-building” in Russian – J.A.] line of Western Christian initiation pronounced in the sphere of special non-church organizations of the initiatic type later concentrated in “Christian Masonry” and “companionships” [4].

Such an initiatic phenomenon in Orthodoxy and especially the absence of the Filioque explain the fact that, unlike Catholic esotericism, in Orthodoxy there are no traces to be found of “hermeticism” as a separate and independent discipline. As a sacred cosmology, “hermeticism” actually focuses on the consecration of the Sacred Cosmos – the realm of the Holy Spirit – as the direct product of the Father, i.e., in the forthright “God-likeness” of the Cosmos, the “theophany” of the Cosmos free from the passage of the “censorship of Logos.” If in full-fledged theology the Logos-Son is naturally shifted onto the supra-individual level that is transcendental in relation to the human mind, then in terms of the degeneration of theological consciousness this hypostasis of the Holy Trinity is in danger of being identified with the human mind which is precisely what happened in Catholic teleology beginning with the exclusion of the apophatic approach. This reaches its conclusion with “rationalism” and “humanism” of a semi-profane character.

Orthodox doctrine, by virtue of its natural, “informal Hermeticism” did not undergo a similar transformation and has preserved its initiatic, super-individual and super-rational nature.

Here it should be noted that there is a second, equally troubling aspect of the arrangement under examination. Being common to the entire people without a strict division into “elite” and “common” forms of spirituality, the Russian Orthodox Church is also posed with the risk of offering mere “virtual initiation,” albeit of a different type than that in the Catholic tradition. In the majority of cases, the “virtual initiation” afforded by Orthodoxy to all Christians can fail to be taken to its logical conclusion in the form of a positive and final goal which, on the one hand, is totally understandable taking into account the necessary difference between the inner nature of people and the overall exclusivity of a fully-fledged initiatic path (there many “called”, but very few “chosen”). On the other hand however, this orientation towards the “super-personal” or “beyond-personal” aspects of apophatic Orthodox theology serves almost exclusively the discursive and rational forms of initiatic doctrines, sometimes extremely important at the preparatory stage. Thus, the realization of “virtual initiation” gradually becomes more and more problematic.

Of course, the chosen, the saints, the elders, and the monks, or any simply exceptional personalities can indeed reach the end of this path, but the majority are compelled to limit themselves to mere “virtual initiation.” Such a stipulation especially explains the phenomenon of the widespread tradition of “Holy fools” in Rus, i.e., those people who have acquired the opportunity of spiritual contemplation, but are incapable of harmoniously combining it with the normal functioning of the individual, rational level of their personality. On the other hand, “Holy foolishness”, as a phenomenon of Russian spirituality, is a particularly telling aspect of Russian Orthodoxy which once again confirms the Eastern Church’s initiatic nature (after all, without any special “initiation,” no holy fools would have existed). The difficulty associated with the complete realization of “virtual initiation”, however, is thus quite clear.

The dark mystery of Cosmism

When Rene Guenon spoke of the “counter-initiatic” organizations of the West, he of course did not put quotation marks around the issue, as the very nature of this topic demands certain precautions. After all, if one summates all of what Guenon said on this question (including in the form of innuendos and assumptions), the following picture unfolds: in the past centuries, “counter-initiation” has manifested itself all the more clearly in the degraded initiatic organization of the “hermetic type” in the West. This can refer to the “offshoots of Masonry” as well as neo-Rosicrucianist or neo-alchemic organizations. These groups, which inherited the secrets and rituals of “virtual initiation”, gave rise to a whole range of pseudo-initiatic occult and theosophist societies in the 19th century which later formed the basis of what has acceptably been called “neo-spiritualism” (Guenon ranked magnetism, spiritism, the theosophism of Madame Blavatsky and Bezan, the occultism of Papus, the anthroposophy of Steiner, and all the extensions and variations of such neo-mysticist and pseudo-esoteric trends as “neo-spiritualisms.” Today the majority of such neo-spiritualist organizations are united under the sign of the syncretic “New Age” movement). Neo-spiritualism itself is not directly “counter-initiatic”, but is an instrument aimed at the destruction of the remnants of the true Tradition in the West under the guise of a “return to spirituality” which in turn leads the profane into the abyss of dissolution in psychic chaos. In turn, “counter-initiation” belongs to a much deeper level of reality, being associated with what has been called the “Devil’s Mission.”

Rene Guenon considered the “Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor”[5] to be one of the most dangerous counter-initiatic organizations. The line is drawn from this to all the more massive neo-spiritualist tendencies, including even those sometimes opposed to its teachings, such as Theosophism, occultism, perverted neo-Hinduism (“Auroville,” Sri Aurobindo Ghosh) and others. It is extremely telling that the doctrine of the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor was called “the Cosmic Philosophy,” “the Cosmic Doctrine”, or sometimes “Cosmism.” The essence of the “Cosmism” of the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor consists of contact with the “cosmos” or “cosmic consciousness” which means the attainment of the “light nature” of the Cosmos (the “light” theme is embodied in the very name of the order, Luxor,

the Egyptian city whose name is similar to the Latin word Lux or "light" and the name Lucifer, or "light-bringer"). The "Cosmic Doctrine" concentrates all attention on the "psychic" or "subtle" plane, practically identifying the "spiritual" and the "super-psychic" with that of the "soul" or "mental" element [6]. This is not a special form of philosophically abstract "pantheism", but a "magical," "concrete", "operative" and "aggressive" one. Besides actually ignoring the transcendental aspects of the Spirit, the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor's Comism also threatened transferring many "initiatic" sacred and spiritual symbols and rituals to the "mental" and material level which entails a "parodying" of true initiation and its grotesque and dangerous imitation. The members of the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor, possessing indisputable paranormal capabilities, were not only the first to formulate the foundations of "neo-spiritualist" theories, but also through provoking mysterious phenomena achieved their speedy introduction in to the most diverse cultural and scholarly environments. Historically, the roots of this secret society date back to several German Masonic lodges of the 18th century in which the members of the highest degree practiced "operative magic." Roots can also be traced back to the unconventional Masonry of the Egyptian Rite (the Memphis-Mizraim) and the "sexual magic" groups of Randolph which displayed considerable "Satanic characteristics." In fact, the Cosmism of the counter-initiatic Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor was later inherited by openly Satanic centers such as the Order of the Templars of the Orient (O.T.O.) of Kellner and Aleister Crowley, which called itself the "Beast of 666."

If we turn to Russia in the second half the 19th century, we discover a quite striking phenomenon which was called "Russian Cosmism" whose most famous representative was Nikolay Fedorovich Fedorov, the author of the famous work *The Philosophy of the Common Cause*. In Fedorov's biography there is no mention of any contact with "counter-initiatic" organizations, but his works remain a compendium of counter-initiatic doctrines that almost exactly match those of the Hermetic Brotherhood of Luxor. Fedorov even maintained the theory of "artificially resurrecting the dead" which Tradition considers to be an outspoken sign of the "Kingdom of the Antichrist." In addition, Fedorov's ideas to a certain extent formed the paradigm for the transfer of spiritual, symbolic, and religious doctrines to the psychic-materialist level. Among these we find the theories of "the management of atmospheric phenomena," the "conversion of churches into museums," and, finally, the "project for establishing a universal and indivisible human brotherhood to include all the 'resurrected love of the ancestors' and become the crown of history." Fedorov's moral utopianism and pantheistic messianism inspired a number of Russian philosophers, scholars, writers, and theoreticians and, what's more, his "Cosmism" was extremely popular in "Bolshevik" circles, who identified the "brotherhood of the risen and resurrected" (sic!) with communism. In some sense, the ideas of Fedorov reflected the exalted revolutionary messianism of the era.

However, Fedorovist Cosmism in fact possesses a purely Orthodox Christian form which was not the only (although perhaps the most striking) manifestation of counter-initiatic Cosmism in Russia. In a broader sense, Russian Cosmism can be called a clearly formulated tendency of Orthodox "virtual

initiation" which (if we recall its universal nature ensured by the mere fact of confessional belonging) was realized not by means of positive ascent from the mental world to the purely spiritual, heavenly, super-individual one, but by means of "fusing" with the intermediately psychic world, that is, the "thin Cosmos." In this Cosmist specificity, "natural" Russian "counter-initiation" negatively affected the issue of the Filioque just as how if the path from the spiritual universe, from the Cosmos of the Holy Spirit to the apophatic Principle of the Father itself is not completed, then no mere "rational" or "formalized" structures can hold back individual beings from "fusing" with the subtle plane and immersing in the Chaos and excitement of what Tradition calls the "Lower Waters." Russian Cosmism is thus the ultimate form of degradation of the "Orthodox Holy Fooldom", a demonic form of this foolishness in which the "Holy Fools of Christ" become the "Holy Fools of the Antichrist." It is this character of Cosmism which sharply distinguishes practically all of Russian philosophy, science, and culture from European profanity just as how "Cosmist" consciousness is drawn specifically to the non-rational, paradoxical, and powerful node of "subtle" energy which breaks through the structure of logical constructions.

If in Russia in the 20th century the most heinous persecution of the Church was indeed carried out under the communist regime, then we should see in this the "natural counter-initiation" of the Orthodox nation deprived of its vertical, holy perspective which, for lack of rational, "logos-related" boundaries, lapsed into the extreme forms of demonic, aggressive, and anarchic Cosmist "foolishness", and above all the "foolishness of the Antichrist."

Conclusion

The features of the Russian Church and its specificity which we have broken down might help understand the bizarre and strange world of the Russian conscience which is similar neither to Western nor to Eastern forms. In his book *East and West*, Guenon identified the Russians as a "people which imitates" the archetypes inherent to the "truly Eastern" peoples. In another place, he noted how "occultist" and "spiritualist" practices are widespread in Russia, something which he saw as evidence of Russians' special propensity for "psychism." Finally, he puts forth the quite mysterious statement that "Russian communism" is most likely something other than what it is commonly considered. Despite their criticality, these assessments indeed very fairly describe the Orthodox people, whose true spiritual elite, albeit too small and too weak, pushed "virtual initiation" to the point of universality, while at the lowest levels it is as if the masses imitated the possession of the true spiritual mystery of the East.

Perhaps the Russian idea of sobornost and "universality" (such as that of the Slavophiles) and later the communists and socialists' idea of "universal equality" were in fact the expressions of a vague consciousness of the "general dedication" of the nation, its "universal brotherhood" (indeed members

of esoteric organizations call each other “brothers” as do “lodges,” “orders,” and monastic communities). It also cannot be excluded that the Bolshevik Revolution was an explosion of part of this justified conviction of “universal dedication” seeking to cancel the “exoteric” hierarchy, the “master system,” as something unnecessary and vicious imposed by the “alien West,” the “Grand Inquisitor” of Dostoevsky, and as a social Filioque which leaving a barrier between the people and the “light Cosmos of the Holy Spirit.” But properly speaking, these same tendencies, only on a closed, conspiratorial level, also enlivened the majority of “counter-initiatic” organizations which were not only anti-Catholic but also foreign to the “socialist” and “communist” pathos. For example, Theodor Reuss, who initiated Aleister Crowley, the Beast of 666, into esotericism, was a known anarchist and socialist. However, in no other country or region of the Earth have such counter-initiatic, thoroughly Cosmist, and mystical-communist trends manifested themselves to such an extent as in Russia, which for more than 70 years became the epitome of the “Red Woman” of the Apocalypse, the Whore of Babylon.

But even long before this period, in the dark political mysticism and plotting of the Time of Troubles (coupled with the succession of the Impostors), in the grandiose stagings of the Apocalypse by the sinister Emperor Peter I [7], in the grotesque parody of the Russian Enlightenment of the time of Catherine and, finally, in the disturbing and psychedelic literature (Gogol, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Sologub) and philosophy (Khomyakov, Solovyov, Rozanov, etc.) of Russia, the sprouts of “the red Cosmos sowed by the virtual initiation of Russian Orthodoxy” matured and produced flowers that pointed not upwards towards the sun of Russian Holiness, the spiritual sun of Sergey Radonezhsky, Nil Sorsky, and Seraphim Sarovsky, but downwards.

The current state of Russia cannot be defined in purely economic or political terms. The seeds of “virtual initiation” (it should not be forgotten that even under the communist dictatorship the majority of Russian baptized their children!) are too significant and active to expect any kind of transformation of Russia into a purely secular, capitalist, or profane state of the “Western” model. The roots of the “Russian phenomenon” are too deep and tragic to count on such an outcome. The Russian soul and, more precisely, the complexity of those “Russians virtually initiated” who form the mystical body of the “Inner Church” cannot abandon their “initiatic” and crucial function. Either there will be a catastrophe even more frightening and deep than under communism or, contrary to all external circumstances, a “spiritual elite” will appear which will halt the rapid decline into the abyss, “instantly” casting the “Nation of the Red Beast” into the Spiritual Heavens of the Holy Trinity much like Christ himself, freeing Old Adam from the snares of hell. If the possibility of salvation still exists for our “counter-initiatic” civilization, then does “initiatic” Orthodox Russia not remain the best place for ascension?

Footnotes:

[1] See *Ver la Tradition*; Nicolas Vardikhas *Est et Oest* N. 43, 1991. The Filioque is the dogma concerning the Holy Spirit's coming not only from the Father, but also the Son (Filio) which was introduced at the instance of Charlemagne.

[2] Guenon considered such a relationship between "spiritual authority" and "temporal/secular authority" to be the only normal form, since it strictly adheres to the hierarchical structure of reality as a whole. It is important to note that "temporal power", or the "authority of emperors and kings" is not considered to be something profane in Tradition. On the contrary, imperial sacrality is practically identified with the exoteric side of Tradition. Hence why Guenon, in his *Christianity and Initiation*, quotes Christ saying "Render unto Caesar." This can be seen as a recognition and "sanctification" of imperial sacrality. The desire of representatives of "spiritual sovereignty", i.e. the Church, to interfere in administrative and political issues (which is characteristic of Catholicism) is a sign of the degeneration of the spiritual nature of this form of government, and an attempt to restore the dignity of the imperial function which thus appears not as a phenomenon of usurpation by the kshatriyas (warriors; the second caste) of the first caste ("priests"), but rather the legitimate defense of certain sacred rights. This observation helps to explain why Guenon himself, being a radical opponent of the "revolution of the Kshatriya" and an unequivocal support of the superiority of the "Brahmins" (the first caste) over the Kshatriyas (as opposed to Julius Evola), so sympathetically treated the Ghibelline tradition and in particular the great Ghibelline poet Dante Alighieri.

[3] It is important to note that the appearance of Iconostasis in the Ancient church chronologically coincides with the transition from esotericism to exotericism. If parallel to the actual "exotericization" of the Western Church the altar, as the "super-heavenly" (iperuranios) element of the Church became visually and spatially open, then the preservation of the altar in the Eastern Church meant its "refrain" from complete "exotericization" by keeping the esoteric element in the center of the church itself, not outside of it as in the case of Catholicism. Indeed, the "super-heavenly," "hyper-Uranian" relevant cannot be exhibited for public meditation without changing the very quality of spiritual influences "theurgically" associated with this space.

But if the altar is kept a mystery behind the forbidden (for the exoteric) wall of iconostasis which both "unveils" the essence of the sacrament of the altar through the holy presence of icons of the Diesis type as well as "hides" such from unqualified view, thus allowing for a delicate balance to be maintained between esotericism and exotericism even without strict formalization. This in fact is the meaning etymologically contained in the term "revelare" which means both "to hide" and "to open." A similar idea is inherent in the Latin word "coelus" or "sky", which comes from the root meaning of "cover" or "cover over" thus connotating both "hide" and "open."

It is also important to note the symbolism of the division of the Orthodox church into three parts: the altar, or "super-heavenly component," the church itself, or the "heavenly component," and the vestibule, or "terrestrial component." Simeon of Thessalonica compared these three parts to the Holy Trinity, the three triads of Angelic orders, and the three categories of the Orthodox people – the presets, the "totally faithful" and the "leaning and converts." Passing through these three stages of the Orthodox hierarchy typologically (or virtually) corresponds to the three phases of initiation: the "work of black," "work of white," and "work of red." Upon the transferring of initiatic rituals to the masses of people, Orthodoxy undergoes particular in regards to the preparatory, first phase, "conversion" and "repentance", as the baptized infant obviously cannot repent or become a convert, i.e. accept the theoretical aspects of the doctrine. The "work of black" is transferred to the post-baptism stage of a person's spiritual realization, and the responsibility of "repentance and conversion" is taken over by godfathers and godmothers who act as a kind of "collateral" for the effective realization of the stage which is completed upon the infant's baptism. In some cases, such a peculiarity yields an extremely negative result since the the spiritual absence of initiatic grain received at the time of the "second birth" ritual chronologically precedes the basic intellectual entry into the teachings of the Church. Consequently, such a presence does is bound to establish a special status for a person which, although raising him above the level of the profane, nevertheless makes it difficult to achieve consistent spiritual realization. Orthodoxy calls this prelest. The extremely widespread distribution of this phenomenon in Russia among parishioners demonstrates the seriousness of the cost which the Eastern Church has to bear in order to preserve its initiatic nature.

[4] Undoubtedly, in the last century Western Freemasonry has significantly changes its operative and initiatic character typical of earlier Masonry. In this case, we are dealing with the transformation of "virtual initiation" into "counter-initiation. Only in such terms is it possible to consider the activities of all of later Masonry to be anti-Christian, anti-Church, and anti-Tradition.

[5] As we have learned from a competent representative of one Western initiatic organization, Guenon was in the possession of the most accurate information concerning the Hermetic Brotherhood, since he himself apparently joined it in his youth!

[6] In Guenon's opinion, this mixture is the main source of diabolical substitution which is unleashed by counter-initiatic forces. In his book *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times*, Guenon explains in detail the "mechanism" of this phenomenon. The Devil belongs to the subtle, psychic world, the world of the soul. Purely spiritual regions, such as the realm of the Spirit, are closed to him. In the world of the soul, during special periods in cyclical history (such as at the end of a cycle), he may occupy a "central" position, but this "centrality" is imaginary and illusory. This illusion is obvious in reference to purely spiritual reality. Thus, the creation of the illusion of the "omnipotence of the devil" is possibly only under the condition of "concealing" the actual spirit level and placing the main emphasis on the

medium, spiritual world in which the efficiency of the Devil is indeed overwhelming at times. As follows, mixing the spiritual with that of the soul is not only misleading, but a dangerous and malignant trend actively and consciously introduced into life by “Satan’s agents” or “Satan’s saints” (ali ash-Shaytan).

[7] See the colorful description of the “eschatological” amusements of Peter in Merezhkovsky’s *The Antichrist. Peter and Alexey*

The Catastrophe of Platonism (Idea and Representation)

Primary tabs

[View](#)(active tab) [What links here](#)

Alexander Dugin

Here we can draw a parallel with the biblical subject of the appearance of the snake in the earthly paradise. It would seem that heaven, Adam, and Eve abide in bliss and abundance; but even in this beautiful and fresh world, forces of coming misfortunes already make themselves known. And even before then, even at the dawn of Creation, when order is first being created and all creatures are close to God, the first of the Angels, of the entities of light, of the ministering spirits, rebels and is overthrown into the abyss with his supporters. From this abyss he later percolates into the earthly paradise. And at the end of times his power will be extended over the world, over the cosmos. But the devil, evil, the presage of the end, appears already in the first pages of the sacred history of the World. In a cloudless, happy heaven his supple body twines around the forbidden tree of the knowledge of good and evil and tempts Eve to try the fruits. Likewise, within the first Beginning, in the situation of the highest tension of spiritual forces and the "heavenly" primordial philosophizing, the great pre-Socratic jump, when philosophy, becoming ontology, still hesitates in indecision [over] how to interpret the being of beings, the end is already drawing near. This "first end" is an end within the first Beginning. Heidegger never regarded this end disdainfully, lightly, arrogantly, contemptuously. He honoured it and was delighted by it, because it was indeed something great. Even in error and delusion there is sometimes scale and scope worthy of veneration.

And for Heidegger, true being (Seyn) speaks through the catastrophe of Socratic and Platonic thought, although in an extremely indirect way, through the oblivion of itself (Seinsverlassheit), through its concealment. The end within the first Beginning is determined by one major name: Plato. According to Heidegger, Plato, and before him Socrates, and after him Aristotle, is the precise name and historical legalization of the greatest catastrophe. Here the teaching of the ideas plays a fundamental role. Heidegger takes apart the basic etymological-philosophical aspects of the movement of Platonic thought, which leads it to the teaching of ideas. Plato's illumination [озаренность] by the ideas and the introduction of the ideas within the framework of his philosophy simultaneously represent for Heidegger both greatness and a fundamental substitution. The greatness consists in the fact that the thought of Plato, as also of all Greek philosophy of the epoch of the Beginning, is moved by the question of the being of beings. In other words, we are dealing with that unique and unexpected jump that Greek thought executes from the truth of beings to the truth of being. And it is impossible not to see this trajectory of thought in all its triumph, risk, and tension, in all its fatality and fatefulness, in Plato, in the very mood of his philosophy. The substitution consists in the following. Before Plato, the philosophical thought of the Greeks still wavered between considering φύσις/λόγος ("physis/logos") as the true name

of being, and thereby relating to being as beings, and moving further, higher and deeper and "seizing" being as a unique event (Ereignis), which does not have anything in itself of beings; i.e. as Seyn (fundamental-ontology). Pre-Socratic philosophy can still be interpreted in two ways. In this question, Plato dots all the "i's", interpreting the preceding philosophical tradition as ontological and making one more very important step in an ontological (and now already unambiguously non-fundamental-ontological) direction. Plato's teaching is the replacement of the wavering of pre-Socratic ontology (the manifestation of being - Sein? Seyn? - through beings) with the presentation of being as an idea. With Plato, being becomes that which is placed before man, and this gives rise to such a phenomenon as "pre-sentation" ["представление": i.e. "before-putting", "before-placing"; unhyphenated, the word is commonly translated as "representation"], Vor-stellung. A man stands before the ideas; ideas stand before the things of the world. The etymology of the word ἰδέα is connected with visualization and originates in the capacity of vision (a participle from the verb ὀρῆναι). On every level of the account of the "cave" in Plato's dialogue "The Republic³", where for the first time the developed teaching about the ideas is given, the discussion is precisely about "vision", at first of shadow, then of the objects themselves, and finally of the ideas. In this procedure of the introduction of the ideas, there occurs in the very centre of philosophical thinking a reduction of the basic operations of knowledge to clear vision, to the detection of ideas, which are the heavenly models of things and phenomena. But contact with the ideas presupposes being opposite them, only thus can they be "seen". From this begins the epoch of a very peculiar direction in the movement of reason, an epoch of a very peculiar rationality, which with Plato and Aristotle becomes the fate of Western European philosophy, predetermining absolutely all its stages, including the Modernity, and before that the Middle Ages, and even earlier, late Antiquity. For Heidegger, the pre-Socratics were located in the world, inside of it; they were beings among beings, thinking beings and thinking of beings among beings. Such were the ancient Greeks on the whole. Moreover, philosophers, abiding in beings and thinking about beings, decided the godly lunge (the δαίμων of the philosophers) in favour of being (Sein? Seyn?), not breaking completely the connection neither with mankind nor with "naturalness". And philosophizing in wonder and amazement, in a state of wonderful ecstasy in an instant (of the daimon) they allowed logos to think through them, giving being (Sein? Seyn?) the opportunity of coming about, show itself through opening up through them [сбыться через них]. And here with the arrival of Plato and his teaching about the ideas man stands before beings: he is no longer in the world, he is before the world; he vor-gestellt, he is presented to the world, he stands-before it. He is no longer able to associate with beings, with the things of the world directly. He cannot participate in the "unconcealedness" of the world (i.e. in its pre-Socratic "verity"). Henceforth, he is doomed to constantly posit between everything, before everything and over everything the idea, an additional authority of a visualized model. From the dynamics of hiding/concealment ["скрытия/сокрытия"] and the constant burst of being in beings we transition to Sein als Idea (being as idea) and, correspondingly, to an additional authority: to the idea, which replaces being with itself. The most terrible of the things that Plato accomplished consisted in the fact that he equated the idea with Sein. The idea was put in place of Sein. By his "decision", Plato made two ontological gestures, fateful for Western European philosophy: he settled (implicitly) in favour of beings the hesitation in the question of the status of φύσις; i.e. he unambiguously interpreted φύσις as the being of beings as essence (Seiendheit, οὐσία), and then he identified the essence with the idea (Plato unambiguously speaks of the idea as the essence, οὐσία). Thanks to this two-fold movement, the

passageway to Seyn-being was irreversibly closed. And although Plato himself and the philosophers who joined with him (Aristotle in particular) constantly raise the question of the essence of beings, i.e. do not drop being from sight, yet henceforth the discussion is only about Sein-being as a "kind", "form", "representation" of Seyn-being. The ontological visual copy passes itself off as the fundamental-ontological original. Henceforth everything changes in comparison with pre-Socratic philosophy. Truth appears from now on not as the unconcealedness of φύσις (and, perhaps, as the unconcealedness of the concealed Seyn-being - through φύσις and through λόγος), but as correspondence (reference). Moreover, that to which beings correspond is henceforth the idea, i.e. to another [of the] beings, which is as Sein and which is contemplated by the mind. In this moment, the open ontological (with the possibility to be fundamental-ontological) topography of philosophy's first jump finally closed in the upper limit, where the idea is placed, and the first of the ideas, the idea of the good (τὸ ἀγαθόν). Precisely from this moment, in which the thought of the being of beings still shines, the process of the progressive oblivion of being (Seinsverlassenheit) and the formation of European nihilism begins. The passageway to Seyn-being is irreversibly blocked up, and in place of Seyn-being is put Sein-being as essence, Idea, and, consequently, as beings themselves. Truth henceforth and until the last end of philosophy in the 20th century is thought of exclusively referentially, i.e. as the correspondence of one being to another (at first it is suggested that it corresponds to the highest being, and then merely to another being). Subsequent post-Socratic philosophers put various ontological constructs in place of the idea as Sein. Thus, Plato's student Aristotle selects ἐνέργεια (energy). Later, other philosophers will prefer other pretenders for the replacement of the "office" of the highest [of the] beings. But this does not change the essence of the picture. After Plato, the ontological topography is established once and for all and remains in effect from the end within the framework of the first Beginning to the very last and final End. Translator: Michael Miller (Martin Heidegger *The Philosophy of Another Beginning* - Alexandr Dugin) ISBN 10: 1593680376 ISBN 13: 9781593680374 note: 1. Heidegger M. *Geschichte des Seyns*. Op. cit.; *Beiträge zur Philosophie (vom Ereignis)*. Op. cit 2. The same Indo-European root was preserved in Russian in the verb "to see" [видеть], as in the Greek. That is, "ideas" [идеи] can be thought of as "looks" [виды] or "visions" [видения], the looks of the original patterns, of the forms. It is rather significant that from the same Indo-European root the word "to know" [ведать] is formed, from which such other words as "area of responsibility" [ведение], "information" [сведение], "news" [весть], "repute" [известность], "report" [известие], etc. In German, the word Wissen, "knowledge", goes back to the same root. 3. Plato. *The Republic*. // *Collected Works*. V. 3. T. 3. M., 1971.

The Deconstruction of Democracy

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The following is an excerpt from Chapter 2 of Political Platonism: The Philosophy of Politics, by Alexander Dugin.

The Concept of “Democracy” Is Not Neutral and Not Self-Evident

Democracy today cannot be discussed objectively. It is not a neutral concept: behind “democracy,” as a political regime and corresponding value system, stands the West, Europe and the USA. For them “democracy” is a form of secular cult or a tool of political dogmatics, thus, to be fully accepted into society in the West, it is necessary by default to be “for” democracy. One who calls it into question falls out of the field of political correctness. Marginal opposition is tolerated; but if it is more than marginal, democracy sets its machines of oppression against its alternatives like any regime, any ideology, and any dominant religion. It is not possible to talk about “democracy” impartially. That is why in discussions about democracy we must say at once whether we are completely for or completely against it. I’ll respond with extreme candor: I’m against it, but I’m against it only because the West is for it. I’m not prepared to accept anything thoughtlessly and uncritically on faith, even if everyone believes it, and all the more so if this is accompanied by a concealed (or clear) threat. You suggest that I rely on my own reason, no? I’ll begin with the fact that reason advises me to reject all suggestions [predlozheniy, offers, proposals]. No one can give us freedom. It either is or it is not [we either have it or we don’t]. A slave will convert even freedom into slavery, or at least into swinishness, and a free person will never be a slave even in fetters. From his time enslaved Plato did not become either less Plato or less free, while we still pronounce the name of the tyrant Dionysus with contempt, so which of them is a slave? At any rate, as a popular textbook on technical analysis says, “the majority is always wrong.”

Contents

Demos in “Democracy”: Aristotle’s Etymology

The Metaphysical Foundations of Democracy: The Hypotheses of the Parmenides

Political Platonism

Only such critical distance in relation to “democracy” provides a field for its conceptual comprehension. We call “democracy” into doubt, into question, and challenge it as a dogma. We thus win the right to distance, but only in that way can we come to a valid and well-founded result. Not to believe in democracy does not mean to be its opponent. It means not to be its captive, not to be under its hypnosis and its suggestion. Starting from such unbelief and doubt, it is entirely possible that we’ll conclude that democracy is something valuable or acceptable, or we might not. We should reason in exactly the same way about all other things. Only that is philosophy. There is no a priorievidence for a philosopher. It is exactly the same for a political philosopher.

Marginal opposition is tolerated by democracy; but if it is more than marginal, democracy sets its machines of oppression against its alternatives like any regime, any ideology, and any dominant religion.

It is worth recalling that democracy is not a self-evident concept. Democracy can be accepted or rejected, established or demolished. There were splendid societies without democracy and detestable ones with democracy, but there was also the opposite. Democracy is a human project, a construction, a plan, not fate. It can be rejected or accepted. That means it needs justification, apologia. If there won’t be apologies for democracy it will lose its meaning. A non-democratic form of rule should not be taken as obviously the worst. The formula “the lesser evil” is a propagandistic ruse. Democracy is not the lesser evil ... maybe it isn’t evil at all, or maybe it is evil. Everything demands reconsideration.

Only from these two assumptions can we examine democracy carefully. It isn’t a dogma, its imposition only repels one from it, and it has possible and entirely relevant and effective alternatives.

Elevating it into a dogma and denying its alternatives closes the very possibility of free philosophical discourse.

Demos in “Democracy”: Aristotle’s Etymology

Let us turn to the etymology of the word “demos,” since “democracy” means “the rule of the demos.” This word is most often translated by the word “narod.” However, in Greek there were many synonyms of the word narod: “ethnos,” “laos,” “phule,” etc. “Demos” was one among them and had specific connotations. Initially “demos” described inhabitants, that is, people living in a concrete and entirely

definite territory. As cities broadened, these territories began to be carved up inside the city, like today's regions or old-Russian city-parts [gorodskiye kontsy], so the inhabitants of one or another region were called a "demos."

In Julius Pokorny's Indo-European Etymological Dictionary, we see that the Greek "demos" stems from the Indo-European root *dā* (**dā-*) meaning "to divide," "to separate." With the formant "mo-" this makes the Greek "demos," and with the formant "lo-" the German *teilen* (divide) and Russian *delit'*.

Thus, in the very etymology of "demos" lies reference to something divided, cut into separate fragments and arranged on a certain territory

Thus, in the very etymology of "demos" lies reference to something divided, cut into separate fragments and arranged on a certain territory. The closest in meaning is the Russian word population [naselenie] but by no means *narod*, since *narod* implies a cultural and linguistic unity, a community of historic being, and the presence of a certain destiny. A population (theoretically) can manage without that. "Population" refers to anyone who has settled or been settled on a given territory, but not one who is connected to that land by roots or the mark of citizenship [i.e. there are three distinct notions here: belonging by roots, belonging by the mere fact of settlement, and belonging through citizenship].

Aristotle, who introduced the concept of "democracy," regarded it extremely negatively, having in mind precisely this entirely Greek shade of meaning. According to Aristotle, "democracy" is practically identical with "mob rule," "ochlocracy (rule of the crowd)," since the population of a civic region consists of everyone without distinction. Aristotle opposes "democracy" as the worst form of rule not only compared with monarchy and aristocracy, corresponding to the rule of one or the best, which he regards, by contrast, positively, but also to "politeia" (from the Greek "polis," "city"). Like "democracy," "politeia" is the rule of many — not everyone without distinction, but the qualified ones, the rule of conscious citizens, differing from the rest by cultural and genealogical, as well as social and economic, indicators. Politeia is the self-rule of the citizens of the city, relying on traditions and foundations. Democracy is the chaotic agitation of a rebellious mob.

Politeia assumes the presence of cultural unity, a common historico-religious and cultic basis among citizens. Democracy can be established by an arbitrary collection of atomic individuals "distributed" into random sectors.

Aristotle, it is true, also knows other forms of unjust rule besides democracy: tyranny (rule of a usurper) and oligarchy (rule of a closed group of rich and corrupt scoundrels). All negative forms of rule are interconnected: tyrants often depend on precisely “democracy,” just as “democracies” often appeal to oligarchy. Integrity, so important to Aristotle, is on the side of monarchy, aristocracy, and politeia. Division, fragmentation, partition into atoms, is on the side of tyranny, oligarchy, and democracy.

The Metaphysical Foundations of Democracy: The Hypotheses of the

Parmenides

Let us turn to the metaphysical foundations of democracy. For this we will draw on the Platonic dialogue Parmenides. It is customary to distinguish two theses and eight hypotheses in it. The first thesis affirms the One. Four hypotheses follow (true, the Neo-Platonists added a fifth, but right now that's not crucial). The first thesis about the One and the four hypothesis following from it can be applied to the description of a republic [gosudarstvo, the word used to translate the dialogue by Plato called Republic in English; gosudarstvo can sometimes mean state in the narrow sense or, as in Plato, regime in the broad sense] based on hierarchy, stemming from the idea, the higher principle. The world built on affirmation of the One is built from top to bottom, from the One to the many. The same is true also of the republic, which reproduces the structure of the universe. At the head of such a republic are the monarch and priests, as servants of the One. Such a holy monarchy is simultaneously a model of the cosmos and a basis for the arrangement of the republic [gosudarstvennogo ustroystva]. The thesis about the One, and the hypotheses that follow from it, describe for us the spectrum of political models of traditional society, where the principle of integrity, the authority and sacral nature of power, and divine law predominated.

Sociologist Louis Dumont called such an approach based on the first thesis and four hypotheses “methodological holism,” since the understanding of society is based on conviction in its organic, integral nature.

The second thesis in the Parmenides, and the second four hypotheses, stems from affirmation of the Many, other than the One. Here, at the basis of the perspective on the world, lies not unity, but plurality, atomism, and the play of fragments. Such a perspective leads to an atomistic perspective on the cosmos (the theory of Democritus) and to the justification of political regimes of precisely a “democratic” type, i.e. built not downwards from above, but upwards from below, not on the basis of the transition of the One into the many, but, on the contrary, in the opposite direction. Plato himself regarded the atomism of Leucippus and Democritus as a “heretical” teaching, and according to some sources, even encouraged the burning of their books in his Academy. In the Platonic understanding of

the world, the society built on the principle of the Many (non-One) can similarly be regarded as a “political heresy.”

Precisely this second thesis of the Parmenides, and the four hypotheses following from it, interest us now. Taking into account the first four, which relate to the monarchic cosmos, it is customary to call these the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th hypotheses of the Parmenides. If we consider them carefully, we will get four types of democracy, which are easy to discover in theory or practice in our surrounding world.

...

Political Platonism

The Platonic hypotheses help us understand the code of contemporary political philosophy. In the final analysis, all eight hypotheses can be regarded as fully rational models of the world and society and if we remove ourselves from the hypnotic suggestions of progress, we can fully make a conscious choice in favor of any of these hypotheses.

Thus, in the very etymology of “demos” lies reference to something divided, cut into separate fragments and arranged on a certain territory

This means that we can select democracy, and any version of democracy, taking the position of the second thesis, or we can choose non-democracy, taking the position of the first thesis and acknowledge the One. What is interesting is that this choice can be made not only today, for it also stood before the people of Ancient Greece, who chose between Atlantis and Athens (the Platonic dialogue *Critias*), Athens and Sparta (the Peloponnesian War, praised by Thucydides), and the philosophy of the monarchists Plato and Aristotle and the liberal-atomists Democritus and Epicurus. While man remains man, he carries in himself, even if vaguely and distantly, a capacity for philosophy. That means that he carries in himself freedom of choice. Man can choose democracy, and one of its forms, or he can reject it.

At the same time, if we take the position of Plato and Platonism, then on the basis of the juxtaposition of democracy and the theses of the Parmenides we come to the conclusion that we live in a cosmos that cannot be: in a society built on an absolutely false dogma. Everyone today is regarded by default as a supporter of democracy. It would not be bad for those “by default” persons to become aware of the philosophical principles to which they are automatically (i.e. without being asked) ascribed.

On the other hand, all opponents of democracy are instantly enlisted in the class of persons professing an ideology the very name of which has long since become a curse-word and an insult, and unscrupulous hypnotists use this technique more and more. Instead of this word, grown hateful and made senseless, which I do not even wish to pronounce in this essay, it is better to call us "Platonists." Yes, we are bearers of political Platonism. We build our conception of the world and society starting from the first thesis of the Parmenides and the first four hypotheses. Others build theirs starting from the second thesis and second four hypotheses. For heaven's sake — would it be so bad to know about this allegiance beforehand?

Being philosophers, that is free beings, we can full well say "yes" to the metaphysical status quo, consisting in the dogmatization of the second [thesis] of the Parmenides (i.e. democracy), but we can also say "no."

I say "no" to methodological individualism and the second thesis of the Platonic Parmenides and thereby clearly determine a place in the ranks, in the army of the supporters of Plato.

Plato burned the books of Democritus. Democrats, and in particular, Soros's spiritual guru Popper, in his catechism *The Open Society and its Enemies*, call to burn the books of Plato. Popper says directly: either enemies of the open society, liberal democracy, the second thesis of the Parmenides, or friends. This is a true war of hypotheses, a battle of epistemologies, a struggle of gnoseological paradigms, a fight of ideas.

Thus, for us, Platonists, democracy is a false doctrine; it is built on a world that doesn't exist and a society that cannot exist.

If that is so, the Platonist comes to a choice: democracy, by its false pretensions, conceals beneath itself something else, but something in any case very bad, unjust, and unhealthy, for instance a secret oligarchy or disguised tyranny, but that is a topic for another essay.

The Dormition of the Mother of God

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 13 of *Mysteries of Eurasia* (Moscow, Arktogeya: 1991)

Theological symbolism

The “Dormition of the Mother of God” is one of the most revered icons in Rus. It is this icon that was first miraculously delivered from Constantinople to Kiev where it consecrated with its divine presence not only the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, but all of Holy Rus, the new (and final) bastion of Orthodoxy.

In the traditional depiction of this icon, we see on the lower level the Virgin falling into slumber on her deathbed surrounded by saints, and on the middle level we see the figure of Jesus Christ standing, holding the soul of the Virgin Mary in the form of an infant in his hands.

In considering the symbolism of this depiction, it is necessary to immediately point to the reverse analogy between the central figure of the Dormition of the Mother of God and the classical “Mother of God” icon. If in the traditional depiction of the Mother of God (for example, the “Vladimir Mother of God”, “Kazan Mother of God,” etc.) we see the ‘adult’ Mother of God holding Jesus, then in the Dormition of the Mother of God we see the inverse: the ‘adult’ Jesus Christ and the ‘infant’ Virgin Mary. Explaining this contrast will help us discover the universal, ontological character of the Christian tradition which, like any fully-fledged tradition, in addition to a historical aspect bears a deeply metaphysical, supra-historical charge directly tied to the spiritual understand of reality at large.

Thus, the very fact of the Incarnation of the God-Word in the material, human universe necessarily implies a certain “diminishment” of the fullness of the second hypostasis of the Holy Trinity, not an essential “depreciation” (the Trinity always remains self-resembling), but an external, apparent, visible depreciation. Christ is described in the Gospel as “suffering.” In the First Coming, the true nature of the Son remains veiled, hidden, and can only be guessed by chosen disciples. But for subsequent generations of Christians, defining this divine nature becomes the basis of Faith – Faith, not Knowledge, since Knowledge is associated with the ontological obviousness of a certain sacred fact, and the obviousness of the Son’s divinity manifests itself only at the moment of the Second Coming, the Coming of the Sacred in Power, in Glory, i.e., in his original ‘non-diminished’ quality. Therefore, the classical image of the Mother of God with the infant has a symbolic meaning that is central to prayer and Church practice. In this icon, as in the sacred map of reality, a ‘diminished’ spiritual center is shown surrounded

by the human or, more broadly, material cosmic nature which externally 'surpasses' this center, is 'predominant' compared to it, and is 'bigger' than it is. The Mother of God with the infant describes the ontological status of the world between the First and Second Coming where the Son is already revealed to the world, but in a 'diminished' quality thereby demanding Faith, personal effort, and spiritual devotion on the part of believers for 'dynamic,' willed transformation of Faith into Confidence.

The Dormition of the Mother of God icon presents us with the inverse proportion. Rising above the concrete historical fact of the Virgin Mary's personal death, the Orthodox tradition here offers a prototype of an eschatological situation, valuably pointing to the meaning of the sacraments of the End Times. The depiction of Christ holding the infant Virgin in his arms describes the true proportions of the spiritual world in which the Center, the Pole of Being, the God-Word is presented not as diminished, but in its full metaphysical extent. In the heavenly world, the 'diminished' is the 'material,' the 'earthly' cosmic portion, while the Spirit itself appears in its entirety. Here the Word is omnipresent and obvious and all-fulfilling. But the material world is not simply destroyed in heavenly reality. It is transformed, it is 'drawn' to the spiritual regions and rises to its heavenly and supra-material archetype. Hence, in fact, the special term 'dormition' (a calque from Greek "koimesis," or sleep, rest, lie; in Latin 'assumptio') in contrast to the usual word 'death.' Dormition means 'solace,' i.e., the transition from the state of 'unrest' inherent to material, physical reality to a state of 'peace,' in which all things abide in the regions of Eternity. Thus there is not 'destruction,' but 'final disappearance' understood by the word 'death.' It would be interesting in this regard to pay attention to the Russian etymology of the word 'uspenie' (dormition), which is akin to the Ancient Indian term 'svapiti' (literally 'to sleep'). This Indian term literally means 'to enter oneself' or 'dive into one's inner self.' As follows, our word 'uspenie' etymologically means 'entering the inner world', the 'inner 'world' being a synonym for the 'spiritual' or 'heavenly' world. In the troparion for the celebration of the Dormition of the Mother of God, it is said: "in falling asleep she did not forsake the world." This refers not only to the compassionate participation of the Mother of God in worldly affairs after her departure, but also the fundamental ontological event of the 'casting of the material world' into the spiritual sphere as a result of a special, unique sacred event. What metaphysical event is symbolized by the Dormition of the Mother of God?

This event is the End Times. It is at this moment, the moment of the Second Coming, that happens the final affirmation of true spiritual proportions in correlation to the material and the spiritual. The 'material' (the Virgin Mary) turns out to be an infinitesimal point in the Infinity of spiritual Light, the Light of the God-Word, Christ. Consequently, the Dormition icon reveals to the Christian the deep mystery of the End Times, which is not a global catastrophe, not the destruction or disappearance of the physical world as is seen most often by those who are only superficially familiar with Orthodox eschatology, but the essential and total restoration of the normal, natural, harmonious ways of being where the spiritual, heavenly Light completely incorporates the physical, material darkness. Therefore, from a Christian perspective, the End Times is the single most important event of an entirely positive, salvational meaning. The End Times is not a catastrophe, but the end of catastrophe since, from a

spiritual point of view, any 'unrest', 'worrying', or 'movement' is essentially catastrophic for the spirit and, in addition, signifies the triumph of inferior, Satanic forces. The End Times, the End of the World, and Judgement Day act as something repulsive and negative only for the enemies of God, only for those who identify their fate with the dark course of restless, demonic fate. For believers, on the contrary, this is salvation, a celebration, and transformation – the universal and final 'dormition' of matter together with the universal and final 'awakening' of the spirit.

Thus, we can now distinguish three levels in this spiritual teaching manifesting such abundant wisdom in the icon of the Dormition.

Historically, this icon tells of the death of the Mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ and her subsequent mercy for the believers and suffering of this world.

Ontologically, it embodies the affirmation of true spiritual proportions of material reality in the larger picture of being, where the spirit fills everything while physical reality is 'diminished' to an infinitely small point.

Eschatologically, it points to the meaning of the End Times, i.e., the restoration of true existential proportions and the affirmation of the absolute triumph of the Heavenly, Divine element. The 'diminishing' of matter in the End Times does not mean its destruction, but its 'induction' into the fullness of light and peace.

Universal symbolism

The symbolism of the Dormition icon (if we juxtapose it to the Mother of God icon) also has analogies outside of a Christian context. The clearest such similar spiritual concept of the structure of being is reflected in the Chinese symbol of Yin-Yang, in which the white dot against the black background signifies the diminishing of the spirit in matter, while the black dot against the white background is, conversely, matter in spirit. However, the Chinese tradition is characterized by contemplation and the absence of an eschatological orientation. Thus, the Chinese are inclined to consider this symbol as a sign of eternal harmony while Christians see ontological plans in an historical and eschatological perspective, hence Christianity's distinctly 'dynamic' character supposing the personal, volitional engagement of man in the outcome of the fate of the spirit. The Chinese believe that this volitional aspect is not so important insofar as the Tao ultimately arranges everything in the best way. Undoubtedly, similar symbolism can be found in many other traditions in reference to the correlations between the material and spiritual worlds, but the Chinese example represents something so clear and comprehensive that all similar parables can be reduced to it.

The sacred sign of Russia

The fact that the icon of the Dormition of the Mother of God was the first to be miraculously brought to Russia and the fact that its presence graced the Kiev-Pecharsk Lavra (which was the first center for the spread of Orthodoxy in Russia) leaves one to believe that Russia is under the special patronage of this icon. The Russian Orthodox tradition and Russian Church believe this. If we take into account all of the theological and ontological, as well as eschatological content of this icon's message, then it is only natural to associate it with the sacred mission and spiritual fate of Russia itself.

On a historical level, such symbolism, applied to Russia, points to the constant participation of the Mother of God in the history of the Russian state, not only during periods of its fully-fledged Orthodox existence, but also during the dark periods of neglect and decline. As if it were a fulfillment of predestination that began with the spread of the Orthodox faith throughout Russian lands, approximately over the thousand years following the founding of the Kiev-Pecharsk Lavra to the moment of the collapse of Orthodox order in Russia, the Mother of God was a believer and declared that 'henceforth She takes responsibility for Russia and sovereign Power therein.' The icon known as "The Sovereign" is dedicated to this. "And in falling asleep she did not forsake the world."

On an ontological level, our symbolism might very well explain the cultural and psychological specificity of Russian Orthodox civilization, which was always contemplatively-oriented, drawn by the spirit to the heavenly sphere where true proportions are set once and for all, while sometimes neglecting earthly, practical, material things which seemed to the religious consciousness of Russians to be just as infinitesimal as the tiny figure of the Mother of God in the hands of the Savior.

Finally, on the eschatological level, the idea of Russia's mission being tied to the End Times is clearly present in Orthodox thought. Hence, in particular, the rise of the idea of "Moscow as the Third Rome" or "Last Rome" who is destined to stand until the final moment of earthly history. If the Dormition icon ontologically describes the ideal essence of the Russian Orthodox soul, then in eschatological terms it points to the active side of Russian civilization, the mission it is destined to fulfill in human history. This mission is, without a doubt, connected to the realization of the End Times and the providential preparation of the Second Coming.

It is also important to recall the omens sent to Saint Anthony of Kiev before the construction of the first and main temple of the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra in honor of the Dormition of the Holy Mother of God. Anthony prayed to God to send him a sign pointing out the place where a church should be built. In the

morning, all of the ground was covered with dew, but in one place the earth was left completely dry. The next day, the miracle was repeated, but in the reverse order. The dew was nowhere to be found other than in the place where there had been no dew the day before. Finally, when the saint was gathering firewood, Fire rained down from the sky and set it alight. After this, no doubts remained as to the place to be chosen.

All three of these miracles have a strictly symbolic and doctrinal interpretation connected to the spiritual meaning of the Dormition. The dry place of the future Church in the middle of the dew-covered space is symbolically identical to the icon of the Mother of God in the which the fiery, dry, light element, Christ, is surrounded by the wet, earthly element, the Virgin Mary. The next day, the opposite occurs, which is the essence of the Dormition icon in which the dryness (i.e., fieriness, spirituality) of the earth surrounds a small, wet space (matter). The third miracle directly concerns the secret of the End Times, when the prepared firewood (the Church of true believers) will be lit on fire and transfigured by heavenly light force, the force of the Second Coming.

In this mysterious story of the founding of the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra is captured the deepest prophecy of the fate of Russia, the fate of Christianity and Orthodoxy, and its glorious and great future.

THE ECONOMIC PERSONALITY

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The person and the individual: distinguishing the concepts

The concept of the 'total worker' as a source figure for economics can be supplemented with the formula of the 'economic person'. The economic person is the total (integral) worker. In this case, the person in its anthropological interpretation (especially that of the French school of Durkheim and Mauss[1] and the successors of F. Boas in the US [2]) takes centre stage. Here personality (la personne) is contrasted to the individual (l'individu), as the person is something social, societal, complex, artificially created, in contrast to the individual, who is an atomic unit of the rest of the human being without any additional characteristics.

The individual is the product of subtraction of the personality from the human being, the result of the liberation of the human unit from any bonds and collective structures. The person consists of a weave of different forms of collective identity which can be depicted as roles (in sociology) or filiations (in anthropology). The person exists and has a meaning only in its relation to society. The person is an aggregate of functions, as well as the result of the human being's conscious and premeditated creation of its identity. The person is never a given; it is a process and a task. The person is constantly built and during construction establishes itself, puts itself in order, or the other way around, as the surrounding world collapses and turns into chaos.

The person is a weave of many identities, each of which is related to a type, i.e. that is to say it encompasses within itself an undeterminably large number of persons as its aspects.

The concrete person is a combination of these filiations (types) and is each and every time something original, as the number of possibilities in each type and, what is more, the combinations of these types – are unlimited.

People use one and the same language, but pronounce it with the help of a multitude of different discourses, which are not really original (as it sometimes appears to the human being itself), but also not as predictably recurrent (as is the case with machines or even the systems of signals of some kinds of animal). Persons also consist of impositions of age-, gender-, social, ethnic, religious, professional, and class identities, each of which has its structure.

Thus, the person is a chain of structures whose semantics is determined by structural context.

The individual is the product of external observation of the human person, where the personal aspect is either unclear or removed entirely. The individual is conceived separately from structures and filiations and is fixed only on the basis of its factual physical presence, reactive nervous system, and ability to move of its own volition. In a certain sense, the individual as a concept is easiest to grasp in behavioural theory: according to behaviourists, the person is 'black-boxed' and engages in contact with its environment; this is the individual and its primary empirical condition.

However, even if the individual is empirically fully realisable, it is purely nihilistic as a metaphysical concept. Behaviourism affirms that it does not know anything about the contents of the 'black box' and, what is more, that it isn't interested in the contents at all. In principle, this is a logical conclusion of the American philosophy of pragmatism. But if the contents are not of interest, that doesn't mean they aren't there. This is very important: pure pragmatism, by refusing to interest itself in the structure of the person, acts very modestly and doesn't draw any conclusions about the ontology of the 'black box's' contents. This is why American pragmatism is only partially individualism, in its empirical aspect.

Radical individualism has other, purely English roots and is mated to the idea of the emanation of all filiational lines.

In other words, individualism is built on the deliberate and consistent destruction of the person, on its rejection and on the giving of a metaphysical and moral status to that rejection: the destruction of the person is a movement towards 'truth' and 'good', which means towards the 'truth of the individual' and the 'good for the individual'.

Here we see the boundary between indifference and hatred: American pragmatism is just indifferent towards the person, while at the same time British liberalism and its universalist and globalist derivatives hate it and try to destroy it. The goal is the transformation of the individual from an empty

concept, created by way of subtraction, in something real, in which the physical separateness of one being would be closed in with the element of the metaphysical abyss (which is received from the liquidation of the person and all its foundational structures).

The economics of the person

After this explication it is easy to apply both concepts (the person and the individual) to economics. The integral (total) worker is precisely an economic person and not an economic individual. Here, the integrality that we characterize as a compound of production and consumption and ownership of the means of production is supplemented with a most important characteristic: membership of organic societal structures. The integral worker lives (and produces and consumes) in a historical-cultural environment, which is what gives him a filiative selection of collective identities. This selection determines his language, sex, clan, place in the system of kinship [3] (C. Levy-Strauss), gender, religion, profession, membership of a secret society, link to the milieu etc. In each of the structures the human being occupies a determined place, at the same time giving it its corresponding semantics.

And it is exactly this which determines his economic activity. The worker (above all the farmer) labours not just for survival or enrichment, but for many others (and often more important) reasons, which follow from the structures that determine his personality. The worker labours by virtue of his language (which is also a kind of economics: an exchange of speech, greetings, blessings or curses), clan, gender, religions, and other statuses. In addition, the whole person takes part in labour, in the whole diversity of its component elements. In this sense, the integral labourer constantly affirms the structures of his person, which makes economics a kind of ontological liturgy, creation, defence, and rejuvenation of the world.

The economic person is a fully concrete expression of type characteristics in which these characteristics, having many levels, combine into a complex and dynamic composite. If structures are common (even if this commonality is not universal, but is defined by the boundaries of culture), then their expression and confirmation in the person is always unique: not only that, but in some cases the structures themselves are different (for example, in the areas of gender, professions, castes, where they are etc.), but their moments are manifested with a different degree of intensity, purity, and clarity. This is where differentials come from, which make life unexpectedly varied: persons which reflect combinations of common (limited, of course, by cultural boundaries) structures, are always different, as each and every one of them carries differently accented and combined elements of these structures. It is precisely this which allows us to examine society as something single, permanent, and subordinate to a general

paradigmatic logic, as well as something that is each time unique and historic, as the freedom of the person is exceptionally great and capable of birthing an infinite multiplicity of situations.

Nonetheless, the society of the integral worker is fully defined by a unity of paradigm where the main rule is the domination of the personality as a base gestalt.

This is exactly what every Traditional society is, where the area of economics is separated into an individual, independent sphere, separate from the other sphere, which contains warriors, rulers, and priests. It is important that the warriors and priests do not directly take part in economic life and appear in the role of the Other, designated to consume the surpluses of the economic activities of the integral worker. What is important here is the word 'surpluses'. If the warriors and priests were to consume more than the surpluses (the 'accursed share' of G. Bataille [4]), the labourers would die of hunger and shortage, and that would cause the death of the warriors and priests themselves. In addition, in societies without social stratification, spirits, the dead, and gods appear as those who destroy the 'accursed share' (surpluses), in whose honour potlatch is implemented. The Russian word 'лихва' [archaic word for profit; trans.] is very expressive: it means something excessive as well as a bank rent and comes from the root 'sinister', 'evil'.

From this observation emerges an important principle of the theory of the integral worker: the labour community of the integral workers must be sovereign in an economic sense, i.e. it has to be fully autarkic in all meanings of the word. In this case it will be independent of add-ons (the warriors and priests), who can either use the 'accursed share' or not be present, in which case the integral workers destroy it themselves via a sacred ritual. In this way the prerequisite for the interiorisation of damnation will be destroyed. And this interiorisation of damnation is the schism (Spaltung) which is capitalism.

Capitalism carries within itself the schism of the economic person, its separation from structure, i.e. its depersonalisation. This leads at the same time to the loss of sovereignty of the trading community, to its dependence on external factors, to the division of labour, and to economic damnation: the integral worker (farmer) turns into a bourgeois, i.e. into an immanent consumer of the accursed share. This is where the disintegration of the personal character of economics and the change of the whole nature of work have their origin: from work as a sacred way of life in the context of personal structures to work as a way to gather material resources. According to Aristotle, this is the change from economics (οἰκονόμος) to chrematistics (χρηματιστική). The person is the main figure of economics as house-building. The individual is the artificial unit of chrematistics as a permanent process of enrichment.

The chrematistic individual

The model of capitalism is built on a view of society as a collection of economic individuals. In other words, capitalism isn't an economic teaching about the economics of persons, but an anti-economic system which absolutizes chrematistics as a schematization of the egoistical activity of individuals. The chrematistic individual is the result of the schism (Spaltung) of the economic personality.

Capitalism assumes that at the foundation of economic activity there is an individual which aims at self-enrichment; not towards the balance of the cosmic structure and the sacral element of the liturgy of labour (as the integral worker), but to self-enrichment, as a monotonous process of the enlargement of asymmetry. This means that capitalism is the deliberate drive towards interiorisation and the cultivation of the 'accursed share'. And it is precisely this that is the chrematistic individual: he attempts to maximize his wealth, and this desire is expressed in the capitalism of desire. Here, desire is anonymous (this is where the 'desire machine' of M. Foucault comes from), as it is not so much the desire of the person which expresses a structure of filiation, but the nihilistic will of the individual, which is directed against such structures. This chrematistic desire is a force of pure nihilism which is directed not only against the personality, but also against economics as a science and, what is more, against the human being as a structure.

Capitalism destroys the cosmos as a sacred field of the existence of a community of persons, at the same time affirming a space of transactions between chrematistic individuals.

These individuals do not exist, as each concrete individual is still (even in the conditions of capitalism) a phenomenological person, that is, a weave of collective filiations. But capitalism tries to maximally reduce this aspect of the person, which is only possible by way of replacing humanity with post-human individuals. It is exactly in this transition to post-humanism that chrematistic desire reaches its apex: the 'accursed share' creates an illusion of the human in coordination with capitalism.

The ideal transaction is only possible between cyborgs: neural networks without any existential dimension or link to personal structures.

But the cyborg is not being introduced to economics today. From its very inception capitalism has been involved with the cyborg, as the chrematistic individual is a cyborg, an artificial concept that emerges from the splitting up of the total worker. The proletariat as well as the bourgeois are artificial figures, developed by way of the dissolution of the farmer (the traditional third function) and the later artificial

assembly of his parts into two unequal multitudes: the urban exploited and the urban exploiters. The cyber-bourgeois and cyber-proletarian are both equally individual and mechanical at the same time; however, the first is ruled by the liberated 'accursed share' and the other by the dark mechanical fate of production, which has its roots in the poverty and nothingness of matter. We become a bourgeois and proletarian when we stop being people, when we reject the person.

Economic eschatology and the 4PT

In the context of the general structure of the Fourth Political Theory we can speak of an eschatological structure of economic history.

In the beginning there is the economic person, the integral (total) worker, who in the specifics of Indo-European societies (above all in Europe) is depicted in the gestalt of the farmer. The farmer is a fully-developed person, who is the aspect of the human being (in a wide sense of the *Anthropos*) which is dedicated to the element of Earth. During the growing of bread, the farmer experiences the mystery of death and resurrection, seeing the fate of man in the fate of a seed. The work of the farmer is the mystery of Eleusis, and it is important that Demeter's gift to the people, thanks to which it could transition from hunting and gathering to agriculture (i.e. the gift of the Neolithic revolution) consisted of bread and wine, the ear of grain and the bunch of grapes. The farmer is a Mysterious personality, and economics in its primordial sense was founded on the mysteries of Demeter and Dionysius. The cults did not just accompany the activities of the farmer, they were the activity itself depicted as paradigm.

He who was inducted into the mysteries was considered a full person in Athens, more concretely, in the Eleusinian mysteries: the mysteries of bread and wine, i.e. in the farmer's mysteries of death and rebirth. This figure is the figure of the total worker.

The next moment of economic history is the coming of capitalism. It is linked to the splitting of the economic person, the disintegration of the unified form of the sacred worker, and, accordingly, with industrialisation, urbanisation, and the appearance of classes: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Capitalism postulates a chrematistic individual as normative figure, describing it as a symbiosis of the animal and the machine. The metaphor of the animal 'explains' the will to survival and 'desire' (as well as the predatory motivation of (anti)social behaviour: Hobbes' *lupus*), and rationality (Kant's 'pure reason') is seen as a prelude to artificial intelligence.

This was implicit in early capitalism (the beginning of the Modern period) and has become explicit in late capitalism (the Postmodern period). Thus, the integral worker has repeated the fate of the seed once more; not in the structure of the annual rural cycle, but in 'linear' history.

However, the linear time of capitalism is a vector which moves towards the pure element of the fall, after which nothing follows and which can contain nothing. The death of the Modern period is a death without resurrection, a fall without sense or hope. And this factor's maximum of irreversible killing, annihilation, is reached with the appearance of the pure individual as a culmination of capitalism as a stage of history.

The pure individual must be a carrier of physical immortality, as there will be nothing in him that could die. There should be no hint of structure or filiation in him. He should be fully liberated of all forms of collective identity and also of existence. This is the 'end of economics'[5], the 'death of the person', while at the same time being the flowering of chrematistics and the immortality of the (post-human) individual.

The seed of the human rots, but in its place there is no resurrected life, but a simulacrum, an electronic Antichrist. Capital is etymologically related to head (the Latin caput), i.e. capital has historically been a preparation for the coming of artificial intelligence.

So what does the economic aspect of the Fourth Political Theory, which challenges liberalism in its final (terminal) stage, consist of?

We must theoretically affirm a radical return to the integral worker, to the economic person against the disintegrated capitalist 'order' (organized chaos to be more precise) and the chrematistic individual. This means radical de-urbanisation and a return to agricultural practice, to the creation of sovereign farmer's communities. This is the 4PT economic program: the resurrection of economics after the dark night of chrematistics, the rebirth of the economic person from the abyss of individualism.

But we cannot ignore the bottomless measure of capitalist nihilism. The problem does not have a technological solution: we cannot fix capitalism, it must be destroyed. Capitalism is not just the piling up of the 'accursed share', it is its very nature. This is why the battle against capitalism is not a competition for a more efficient economic system, but a religious, eschatological battle against death.

Historically, or to be more precise, hierohistorically, seynsgeschichtliche, is the before last note of the Eleusinian mystery. Economics rots under the weight of chrematistics, the economic person has been

ripped to shreds by the individual, the elements and structure of life have been destroyed by the mechanics of electronic desire.

But this all begins to make sense when we take economic history as a mystery. This is the final hour before the dawn. Capitalism has reached its final stage. The seal of the electronic Antichrist has been broken, everything is becoming clear. This is not just a crisis or a technical failure; we are entering the time of the Last Judgement.

But that is the moment of Resurrection. In order for the Resurrection to happen, the subject of the Resurrection is necessary, i.e. the enlightened one, the person, the farmer, the human being. But it is exactly this figure that dies in history. And it seems like it is absent. That it is no more. And returning it is impossible: the distance from the moment of innocence (the traditional society) is irreversibly far away and grows with each and every moment. However, the distance towards the final Resurrection is shortening. And everything that is wagered on that which must rise again will be kept safe until the final, explosive blast of the archangel's trumpets.

This is why we don't just see the integral worker, farmer, or economic personality in our perspective, but the integrated worker, not the seed-personality, but the ear-personality, the bread-personality, the wine-personality. The farmer today is called to a militia, his fate in the hour before the dawn (the darkest) is to become part of an economic army, whose goal is victory over Death and the pacification of time, having made it subordinate to eternity.

The Fourth Economic Theory cannot be the next projectionism or consist of fantasies about modernisation and optimisation. This is not our projectionism nor our fantasies, who are encoded in the world of our imagination by Capitalism. We must think in terms of the person, not of the individual, historically, not situationally, economically, not chrematistically.

This isn't about the building of a system of economics that is more effective than liberalism, it is about the destruction of the 'accursed share'.

Accumulated wealth is a devil's gift, it falls apart at the first gust of wind. Only a free gift belongs to us personally, only something that has been given away, sacrificed, gifted without the want for compensation is our property. This is why the dream of economics must be resurrective, resurrecting, a dream about a Gift.

Sources:

[1] Мосс М. Общества. Обмен. Личность. Труды по социальной антропологии. М. : Восточная литература, 1996. Maussse M. Une catégorie de l'esprit humain : la notion de personne celle de "moi" //Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute. vol.LXVIII, Londres, 1938.

[2] Benedict R. Patterns of Culture. NY: Mentor, 1934; Wallace A. Culture and Personality. NY: Random House, 1970; LeVine R. A. Culture, Behavior, and Personality. NY: Aldine Publishing, 1982; Funder D. The Personality Puzzle. NY: Norton, 1997; The Psychodynamics of Culture: Abram Kardiner and Neo-Freudian Anthropology. NY: Greenwood Press, 1988.

[3] Lévi-Strauss C. Les Structures élémentaires de la parenté. Paris; La Haye: Mouton, 1967.

[4] Bataille G. The Accursed Share.

[5] Дугин А.Г. Конец экономики. СПб:Амфора, 2005.

4pt

The end of Present World

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The End of thePresent World; Post-American Future

(London conference 12.10.2013)

Part 1. Philosophy of the Presence. Present/absent modern World.

(philosophical)

1. The Present World is not something given. The world is something that is created in the process of human existence. We don't exist in the World as something taken for granted. Existing, we constitute the world by the very fact of existing. Modernity insists on the objectivity of the world. But the objective world can really be present – because in order to be present it needs to have being, it has to be, to participate in the Being Essence. But the question of being demands a witness who must be a thinking, judging entity. Only the intellectual moment defines whether or not the world is present and by judging the presence it automatically constitutes the world as something present. So the world in order to be should be present and has to be installed as such.

2. In the contemporary world, modernity is increasingly disinclined to endeavour to make the World present. So it is relaxing and here begins Post-Modernity. Post-Modernity is the refusal to try to make the World as something present, refusal to be-in-the World. German philosopher Eugen Fink has dedicated very important philosophical phenomenological works to the problem of the world. According to him the world can not be equated with the sum of worldly things. It is something more than them because it is the whole. The intuition of the whole is the existential effort creating the world as a whole. So only human beings know the World precisely because only human beings create it by the fact of being human.

3. Martin Heidegger in “Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik” explored the subject, pointing out that the stone is worldless (weltlos) and the animal is poor of the World, destituted of the World (weltarm). So the World is present when the human is human, when man exists authentically. But to be human is difficult, it demands to affront the death and the End. To exist really is to exist in front of the End, on the Edge. And that means to exist creating the event of Being, the understanding of Being as something limited

and ending, surrounded by the Death and nothingness. To be in such way is possible only in the realm of the sacred. If we abandon the sacred we can not perceive the Being as the event. So we are losing the world as something present; it is precisely the end of the present world understood as the process of Ending. Not End as something given, but the Ending as something lasting. Ending more and more. More and more approaching the End but never reaching it effectively.

4. So the End of Ending begins when we refuse to exist authentically – in the midst of the sacred, surrounded by death and apophatic nothingness, intensively and dangerously. Modernity is precisely such an epoch. It is based on the objectivation of being, the commodification of it is the last stage. So being modern in the sociological sense means being not present. It is the famous oblivion of being, the absence of being, the occultation of being. So modernity is the phase where being more and more refuse to exist. Refusing to exist we stop the process of the presencing of the World. Stopping the process of the presencing of the world, the world ceases to be present. It begins to be absent. But it holds still. It's vanishing is delayed due to the fact we are not working any more in order to make it present. What does that mean? How can we explain the metaphysics of the delay?

5. The only solution is virtuality. Under the conditions of virtuality nothing needs to be really present, but at the same time nothing is really absent. Why is nothing really absent? Because the absence demands the witness who can testify that there is not a particular thing or that there is nothing at all. But in order to stand witness we need to be and to exist. But to exist is the same as to be-in-the-World. To-be-in-the-World is the same as to make the World present. But this is not the case today. That is why the World doesn't end effectively as it should. That is why it proceeds to "be" as a simulacrum. It is the nature of the virtuality. The virtuality is the delay, the lapse of (post) history when there is no more World but there is not nothing. Nor something, nor nothing. The virtuality is precisely this: the never ending End, eternal ending.

6. The Post-Modern conditions try to make such a situation normal and normative. If the Ending never ends it is not the Ending at all. So they mock the eschatology or promote its caricatural versions. So the never-ending End laughs at itself playing with the paradox. So the End of the present World is not beyond it nor fixed in time: it is the other side of the virtuality and it produces itself here and now. But nobody sees it because the virtuality doesn't give us the distance to perceive its other side. We are in trap. The End is here but it eludes us. It feigns not to be what it is.

7. Our aim is not to save the World. To save the World today signifies to save the Ending, to help it to be ending even more and more, to support its fake eternity and prolong the illusion. Our aim is not to end the process of Ending because doing this we would help but to further endorse the decadence. Our aim is not to begin something new because in the midst of Ending anything "new" will be immediately seized and appropriated by the Ending and turned into a new virtual distraction. Our aim is to fix the Ending as Ending and to demonstrate its real nature – the nature of the End. Only thus we can reveal the absence of the present World and disclose the fact that the End is really the End. So we need to expose the ontological nature of the virtuality in what it is not present and is not World.

8. If we try to compare the virtuality with reality in the sense of modern philosophy we are doomed from the beginning. The concept of reality is simply the first stage of transition to the virtuality, its beginning. Reality is the product of the desacralization of the Sacred so it is profane in its core and the result of the reductionist disenchantment of the World. The reality is in its essence already the virtuality. Reality as a Modern concept is virtual and nihilistic. So we should compare the virtuality with something Pre-real, that is Pre-Modern, that is Sacred.

9. The philosophical dilemma is Virtual vs Sacred. Both are beyond the real – one from beneath, other from above.

Part 2: The End of the USA - The End of the Other Countries - Peak Behind

(geopolitical)

1. Geopolitically: The USA is showing the signs of its collapse. We see the agony of the unipolar world. The USA cannot propose any more realistic programs for the various parts of its global imperial control. There are some important points that are central to the global system.

2. Economy. The present liberal system is based on the concept of progressive, unlimited and infinite growth. In the financial economy the factor of time and timing acquires more and more significance. So if we are sure of the growth of the progress of the world economy we evaluate the future in a very particular way. It affects not only the problem of refinancing credit but also a huge segment of special financial and credit instruments, economization of the debt and so on. In the 80s and 90s the whole liberal economy aided in persuading the entire world of the certainty of everlasting growth – the growth of the middle class, of salaries, of industry and the world economy. The world has believed their story. And that was not benign because this credulity has opened a new economic strategy of globalization – a new speed of globalization that was defined in completely the wrong way. So the limits of growth taken for unreachable were reached in the early 2000s and that was a clear sign of catastrophe. The crisis of 2008 was the last call. The collapse of the banking system was avoided only by the acquisition of debt by the USA. But the credit policy remained the same. Since the appointment of Ben Bernanke everybody has understood that we are entering the Apocalypse: the Federal Reserve policy will surely remain the same and ahead of us there is only the bankruptcy of the USA. The toxic deposits were transferred to the US government and all global financial systems became toxic. So we are approaching the moment of the bankruptcy of the USA. What next? The bankruptcy of societies- because the last to answer for the collapse of the faulty prognosis of eternal growth are the people. So the people are doomed. They will be obliged to pay the expense for a few decades of the global oligarchy's rich life which has already past. The future has already been sold and eaten. There is no future, it was demolished by the post-cold war euphoria of the recent past.

3. Geopolitics. The unipolar moment of exclusive American domination is also behind us. The website of The Project of New American Century created by neo-conservatives is in a lamentable state – no updated items, all is frozen in the position of the early 2000s. Nobody dares to predict a positive future for the US. The US empire is sinking down swiftly. The BRICS countries are rising and communist China, instead of all twaddle about incompatibility of the totalitarianism and economic growth, is soon going to be an economic leader. The example is clear: liberal democracy doesn't automatically mean economic prosperity. They are absolutely independent. You could be democratic and poor, totalitarian and rich, but also democratic and rich or totalitarian and poor. It all depends.

4. The other aspect: The US was obliged to step back in two concrete and sufficiently humiliating situations: The August 2008 Russian attack on the Georgia, a devoted liberal ally of the USA, and the joint Russia-China refusal to let the US bomb Assad. The British refusal to follow Washington is very symptomatic. That is the real end – finished and final end this time – of the unipolar World.

5. The present crisis of US government refinancing and shutdown is another sign. The USA could fall very quickly. It is certain that US will fall. No matter whether tomorrow or later. That is the end: both theoretically and empirically. Theoretically: the USA has lost its power of fascination. It doesn't sufficiently inspire anybody any more. They had the chance to rule the World and they pretended to rule it. They have lost that opportunity. It is time to pay. The unlucky empire will pay a hundred times more – it is the price of the fear of some and the deception of others. The USA is doomed sooner or later.

6. Where are we with Israel? A serious question. The problem of Israel is not geopolitical or economic. It is theological. Their Messiah is not coming. Jewish calculations unanimously say: it is high time, he certainly should hasten. If USA falls there will almost immediately be one Middle-Eastern country less. Guess which one? So he definitively has to appear because all political and military actions of the Jews in the second half of the 20 century were orientated toward his coming. If he delays any more they are lost. He will come neither now nor later. It is really bad news. Bad news for good Jews. They could promote a simulacrum of the Sabbatai Zevi kind. A Virtual Messiah. It seems they could. And maybe will. So much worse for them. The internet can not save. Nor can a golden calf, nor a big lie.

7. The definitive default of the USA could be regarded as good news (this time) for BRICS countries and for all partisans of multipolarity – in the East, in Latin America, in Eurasia and so on. But there is also a problem. The level of liberalization, democratization, Americanization, globalization and so on is too shallow to be irreversible but too deep to quite be benign. It has just reached the middle of the Non-Western societies. That is not enough for them to be Western and modern (post-modern) but enough to no longer be Eastern or traditional. So the collapse of the USA will not signify a definitive victory and triumph for Russia, China, Latin America, India or the Arab countries. Their elites and a considerable part of their societies are Westernized enough to not even be able to imagine the alternative. Everybody there continues to religiously believe in the USA and the golden calf. The counter-current and the enemies of USA are the modernists and Westerners within. Everybody wants the USA to be weaker but nobody wants it to disappear entirely. But it will disappear. That will be a catastrophe for all countries,

because they will inevitably fall just after. So seeing the USA collapse, everybody will run to help it. It will be useless. So the turn to collapse will come quickly.

8. The USA is liberalism, its final stage. The USA is modernity itself. The USA is post-modernity. The Empire of the End. The last one. The end of the USA will be the end of the Modernity as such. It will destroy all that is Modern. Not only the financial capitalism of the new economy, not only financial oligarchy but all economy including the industry that is too deeply embedded in the global financial structure. Only agricultural, rural, almost-self-sufficient communities could survive. Something like the imagery of "Mad Max" is ahead of us.

9. So the End of the USA will signify the End of Modernity as a sociological, historic and philosophic concept including science, anthropology, economy, technology and so on. All that is contaminated by modernity will collapse. So we are approaching the end of the modern world. When exactly? Nobody can say definitively – I think soon. Or a little later. We will see.

Part 3: The Choice - Platonopolis. The 4th Political Theory and the multiplicity of Daseins. The Titans
(moral issue)

1. A Philosophical and geopolitical survey of the situation with some points consciously emphasized in a somewhat excessive way in order to clarify things further raises a question of a moral nature: what to do? Do we Have a choice and if so what choice?

2. I believe the choice always exists because the essence of the human being is freedom. But not always is the choice identical or indefinite. Every historic situation presupposes a special choice or set of choices. And choices are distributed in very particular way among different kinds of persons. So I give my opinion – my choice.

3. My choice is the Fourth Political Theory beyond three political expression of modernity – liberalism, communism and fascism. All of them are impregnated by modernity. I reject modernity (it is my choice) and I am very glad it is coming to its end. For me it was always the End and I enjoy the final End of Ending. I think that we need first of all to found a proper space beyond the virtual reality of modernity where we should establish the figure of a witness that can pronounce the truth of the absence of the not-present virtual World pretending to be present. So we need to emigrate from modernity into the realm of the Sacred and prepare our strategic base there. That is the main frame of The Fourth Political Theory – to create a completely new political Philosophy, political Metaphysics completely free from modernity – against liberalism, against communism and against fascism.

4. We need to affirm a new political subject: not the individual (as in liberalism), not class (as in communism), not race (as in national-socialism). So I propose it to be the philosophical term dasein – the Being There or Being T/Here. It roughly means the core of human existence as a thinking presence.

From that point we need prepare an existential revolution, the uprising of dasein against alienating forms of modernity. Individual, class and race are simply concepts. Dasein is not a concept; it is Presence itself, the Presence constituting the World – as Event, as the existential space surrounded by the Death. Being on the edge of the Death – dangerously, thinking, creating the Whole as the outburst of the Light – it is the axis of dasein. Every man and every woman could discover the dasein inside of them, or better to discover themselves inside of dasein. Dasein is human essence – Menschsein. Everything could pass or change. Dasein is always here, can be here, should be here. It sleeps. Modernity is based on the sleep of dasein. It should awaken. It should stand up. It should begin to think and to act.

5. Heidegger defined the Man as Watcher of Being. The term Watcher if Greek fulax is the name of the political head of Plato's ideal State, the ruling philosopher. The head of state in al-Farabi's perfect state is considered in Plato's sense the one who is united with the divine Intellect, the prophetic ruler, the Philosopher King. Authentically existing dasein is the Philosopher King. My alternative is Platonopolis where the phenomenologists rule – Philosophers of Martin Heidegger's school. So humanity is concentrated in the dasein of those who exist authentically. So I am in favor of an existential Empire – the Empire of the Event/En-Owning, Er-Eignis, the Empire of the Being that should be an absolute alternative to this ending and ever-delayed pseudo-World of simulacra.

6. In order to make the decisive step we need to define the proper moment between too early and too late – that is the Kairos, the right moment. Such a moment is approaching us, coming nearer and nearer. The moment of their fall should be the moment of our (possible) rise, the window of opportunity at least. But that cannot be something mechanical – the fall of USA will provoke the fall of the others. So we need to be separated from such “others,” not to be with them in their end – they all deserve to stop being because they refuse to really be here, they refuse Being T/Here. So we need to go against what will naturally follow the fall of the USA. The fall of the main evil will be followed by the fall of the lesser ones. We should not be with them. It will be the time to attack. Our Kairos.

7. The Fourth Political Theory is pluralistic. I believe in the multiplicity and diversity of daseins. Every culture or civilization. Every religion and society has its own special dasein. We could not impose our existential criteria on them. They need to awake their Daseins by themselves. Everybody understands the Event – en-owning in proper terms. For Iranians it is the coming of Mahdi. For the Aztecs the Return of Ketzalkoatl. For the Europeans the awakening of the sleeping emperor. For Indians it is Kalki. For Buddhists Maytreya. For us Russians it is the appearance of Saint Sophia the Feminine epiphany of the Sacred Logos. Let the people resurrect their gods. All of them were killed or chased away by the titanic theocide of modernity. As Friedrich Junger has said: “where there are no more gods there titans appear”. The Titans. Right name. They have risen to the top of the Sacred Mountain, they have driven out our gods, they have imposed their perverted materialist vision and their unjust and corrupted societies and greedy elites. They promote hubris as norm. That is modernity – in every version: capitalist, marxist or nationalist. Now is the right time for the titans to fall. And for the gods to return.

8. Heidegger once said: “It is in vain to wait for God or the gods to come. He or they will not come. Because they wait for us to come and to prepare the place for their Return.” To put the End to the

everlasting Ending is our task. Not theirs. Our gods are different. But the enemy of all gods is the same. The Titans. Now they are on the edge of their highest point imaginable. But nothing can grow infinitely. Once comes the moment of the fall. This moment is near. But when? That may depend on us.

Thank You for the Your attention.

4pt

Global

The Eurasianist Polemic in the Opposition

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Written in 1992 for publication in the newspaper Den, but rejected for being too “intellectualist”; subsequently published in the book *Konservativnaya Revolyutsiya* (Moscow, 1994)

The Opposition and the System

In recent times, the delicate balance in the political and ideological opposition's camp has begun to be disrupted by a burgeoning polemic between the “ethno-centrists” and “Eurasianists,” “reds” and “whites”, etc. On the one hand, this polemic has clarified the doctrinal principles of various tendencies, movements, and parties which before were too often vague and only unconsciously formulated. This is a positive aspect. On the other hand, this process is a sign of the opposition entering a scheme arranged by the System, i.e., its “conventionalization”, taming, and “castration” in sterile, parliamentary, and party “games.” It should be noted that this process of eliminating opposition not through repression, but through domestication, gradual corruption, and “sterilization” has been brilliantly worked out in the mondialist West. In the words of Jean Thiriart: “There are two ways to destroy a revolutionary ideology (particularly communism): bureaucracy and parliamentarism.”

It is rather telling that in developed mondialist societies, there is in fact no opposition which really challenges the very principles of the System. Both right and left are but elements of a deliberate and cunning play. Our opposition, however, which took shape following August 1991, is a genuine opposition embodying the profound opposition of certain segments of society not only to specific actions of the ruling group, but to the very foundational principles of the worldview that has triumphed in the country following the defeat of the coup.

The onset of such extensive polemics within the opposition could lead to its fragmentation and subsequent integration into political niches specially prepared for it by the regime itself. Hence why it is very important to here and now clarify the emerging differences in outlook within the opposition and surmise the logic of their potential development.

The beginning of the polemic: Eurasianists and ethno-centrists

The main line of the emerging division in the opposition runs between the “Eurasianists,” “statists”, and “national-communists” on the one hand and the “nationalists”, “Panslavists”, and “monarchists” on the other. The main criterion and central motive of this debate is the question of our approach to the state and ethnos. It is precisely this understanding that is dividing the opposition today, and not the question of attitudes towards communism, religion, Marxism, etc.

On both flanks there is an extreme right (including anti-Marxists, Orthodox, and fascists, etc.) and an extreme left (including former members of the party apparatus, communists, socialists, etc.). The Eurasianists and “statists” affirm the superiority of the State over the Ethnos. Their nationalism is openly imperial, supra-ethnic, and geopolitical in nature and is often coupled with the traditionally Russian, Orthodox, state-religious messianism of the God-bearing people. For this wing, the dismemberment of the USSR is an Absolute Evil, and the perpetrators of this atrocity are to clearly designated as national criminals with whom no constructive dialogue, conciliation, or compromise can be made. This is the “irreconcilable, radical opposition” which boasts strong political determination to fight the System to the very end. In this struggle, the Eurasianists are ready to ally with any religious, national, and geopolitical forces in both East and West that can help in the fight against mondialism and contribute to the re-establishment of the Empire. Speaking in geopolitical terms, the “statists” consider mondialism and the thalassocratic USA to be the main enemy.

The “Slavophile nationalists”, for their part, assert the primacy of the ethnic factor. Such nationalism is limited to either the Great Russian ethnos or to advocating a pan-Slavic union. This camp harbors two poles: the pole of “ethnic minimalism” embodied in the projects of the St. Petersburg-based ROD organization which proposes to establish a mono-ethnic Great Russian state, and the “ethnic maximalist” pole which at times even proposes to restore the USSR, but only in the context and over the course of Russian national military and economic expansion into the breakaway republics (for example, under the pretext of defending the Russian population). The Slavophile nationalists do not rule out the possibility of dialogue and cooperation with the government under the condition that the influence of open and odious Russophobes and non-Russian peoples is restricted. In all cases, for them the main enemy is other peoples, Jews, etc. For them, geopolitical factors are of secondary and purely practical value.

Mutual claims

Both poles of the opposition have a number of fundamental claims against one another which are easily distinguishable. The ethno-centrists accuse the Eurasianists of:

betraying the interests of the “Russian ethnos” by agreeing to cooperate with other peoples (especially Turkic peoples and sometimes Europeans);

betraying the interests of Orthodoxy by cooperating with anti-globalist Islam and European Catholic, Protestant, or pagan national revolutionary movements;

betraying the Russian Monarchy by extending a hand of cooperation to national-communists (who are alleged to be responsible for the October coup and the destruction of the Tsarist regime);

betraying the unique folk character (Narodnost) of the Russian people by appealing to esoteric teachings and initiatory practices (which are unequivocally associated with “masonry”);

allowing for elements of socialism in the economic system of the future Empire (which is supposed evidence of a certain continuity with communist theories);

claiming their ideology to be superior within the entire opposition on the basis of its openness, universality, and globalism (which detracts from the position of pure “nationalists”);

finally, betraying Conservatism by adopting ideas of technological development, social construction, and state futurism (which contradict national archaic tendencies).

The Eurasianists, in turn, have also presented a number of claims against the ethno-centrists. They accuse the latter of:

aiding the collapse of the USSR by demanding sovereignty for Russia and the establishment of the foundations of statehood within the RSFSR (which only played into the hands of the democrats and mondialists);

provoking tensions surrounding the Russian population in the republics (since restricting the Russian nation to a narrow ethnic framework cannot but lead to alienating them from the other peoples of the empire);

depriving the patriotic movement of geopolitical awareness of the American strategy to conquer Eurasia (an aspect which the Americans take advantage of in extending their hands to those regions which the Russians leave unattended upon deciding to “focus on their own problems”);

diminishing the “universal”, “imperial”, and “messianic” nationalism of Russians to the level of purely ethnic borders (thus rendering Russian nationalism powerless, passive, and incapable of realizing its state mission);

conformist engagement in dialogue with the anti-national, mondialist, and pro-American Russian government whenever it makes hypocritical gestures towards Russian traditions (archaic and innocuous national-religious folklore);

idiotizing Russian traditions in advocating for the restoration of archaic and lurid aspects of pre-revolutionary Russia and renouncing the technological, strategic, and industrial achievements of the Soviet period;

too often advocating private property (national capitalism), which contradicts Russia's social traditions;

finally, for being the main initiators of the split in the opposition by virtue of refusing the alliance consistently offered to them by the Eurasianists in line with the openness and pragmatism of their ideology which sets reconquering the State and restoring the Empire as its main goals.

Who are the Bolsheviks? Who are the Mensheviks?

Such are the fundamental motives of the growing disputes among the opposition which can hardly be stopped at the level of authoritative leaders calling for harmony and unity and offering admonition and personal sympathies. On this issue, however, these contradictions are fundamental in nature and can be circumstantially compared to the dispute between the Bolsheviks and Mensheviks. The Eurasianists are the Bolsheviks who refuse to compromise with the corrupt mondialist government, stoop down to parliamentary demagoguery, pursue conciliation with the system, and who do not intend to opt for limited and ambiguous compromises. The ethno-centrists are the Mensheviks who are content with limiting themselves to pursuing gradual reforms on the national level and abandoning the planetary National Revolution for the sake of small concessions from the mondialists who are willing to present Russians with a folklorish "national being" in Eurasian reserves.

In addition, it is an extremely important fact that the Eurasianist camp is engaged in a process of ideological creativity which is resulting in the formation of new concepts, such as "Slavophile futurism" and the great idea of the "Eurasian Empire" which in the future will be capable of not only recovering Russia's lost geopolitical might, but also becoming a center of anti-mondialist doctrine suitable for giving impulse to the planet-wide process of ideological and geopolitical liberation from American bankocratic domination. This ideology is offensive, aggressive, and universally applicable – in both Europe and the Third World.

The "nationalists" are only focused on passive, defensive resistance. They look backwards with passionate nostalgia and sentimental longing for the past. They are loyal not so much to the spirit and essence of the Russian Tradition as to its external forms. Yet the mono-ethnic model of Russia is without a doubt an entirely "modernist" idea, as nothing of the sort has ever existed in Russian in all of her history.

However, it would be wrong to associate the “Bolsheviks” of the opposition (the Eurasianists) with “modernism” and the “Mensheviks” with “archaism.” In fact, both poles contain both modern and traditional elements, albeit only combined in different ways. The imperial orientation, openness towards non-Russian ethnol, elitehood, and community-based economic traditions make up the deeply traditional aspects of the Eurasianists’ side. Yet the Eurasianists are modernists in terms of industrial, technological, and military-industrial projects and in supporting the establishment of global information systems and modern communications systems. The pure “nationalists” are modernists in their “mono-ethnicism”, their dislike for elites (which is evidence of individualism and egalitarianism), and in their sympathies towards national capital. On the other hand, their rejection of industrialism and technological development is a purely archaic feature.

Are we already that different?

One particularity of this division should be emphasized, namely, that the Eurasianist wing of the opposition is potentially ready for dialogue and cooperation with the ethno-centrists. After all, the Eurasianists largely share the feelings of “ethnic nationalists” on the emotional level, but they refrain from taking such to the level of a doctrinal, ideological principle. The “national reaction” of the Eurasianists is mediated and deferred. For example, although they might experience the exact same dislike for the mafia-capital Caucasians as the ethno-centrists, the Eurasianists nonetheless refrain from escalating this aversion to a political category. While sympathizing and empathizing with those Russians who have found themselves outside of Russia’s borders, they do not blame the indigenous, non-Russian populations of these republics. Rather, in remembering the reason for this state of affairs, they blame the puppets of the Americans who have seized power in Russia itself for such treason.

Similarly, while being overwhelmingly Orthodox, the Eurasianists do not insist on proselytism (which is in fact entirely alien to the Russian Church) and instead seek strategic alliance with all anti-mondialist forces in Eurasia regardless of their religious affiliation (while at the same time taking into consideration the metaphysical specificities of different religious by virtue of which, for example, fatalistic and anti-individualist Islam is typologically closer to Russian Orthodoxy than the Anglo-Saxon, individualist, and subversive Protestant pseudo-Christianity of showmen preachers).

Thus, the “Eurasianist Bolsheviks” stand for unity of the opposition. On the inside, they understand their ethno-centrist opponents, but remain convinced that ethno-centric projects are hopeless and ineffective. Nor are the Eurasianists characterized by such “patriotic spy-mania” in which “agents of Judeo-Masonic influence” are seen everywhere. In fact, it is only those most radical ethno-centrists who refuse to enter into dialogue with the Eurasianist statist, who conform with the anti-people, anti-

Russian government, that should be suspect of belonging to the Atlanticist lobby, since a radical rejection of the foundations of Eurasianist geopolitics solely benefits the US' agents of influence whose main task is weakening and subjugating the Eurasian continental powers at any costs.

Splits benefit the enemy

In summing our remarks, the following point must be expressed: If the opposition were to finally split into "Bolsheviks" and "Mensheviks", then its internal structure would be violated and its "implacability" and "radicality" would be lost. The ethno-centrist flank would most likely be integrated into the System in the role of a harmless, folklorish "party of reserves" and the slogan "Russia for Russians" would proceed to destroy the last remnants of statehood, alienating other peoples and provoking further separatism within the Russian Federation. Left alone, the Eurasianists would be considerably marginalized and it would be much easier for the System to finally kill them off. The "Bolshevik" wing of the opposition could furthermore be finally weakened by a new showdown, such as one between "communists" and the "right" or "socialists" and "fascists", etc. In any case, we must anticipate the future outcome of such ideological and political disputes.

It is unlikely that this polemic, which is already picking up, can be avoided. Nevertheless, already today must we realize what it is inevitably leading to and seek not simple party compromise, but genuine ideological synthesis. It is absolutely obvious that the Eurasianists' openness and their organic solidarity with ethno-centrists yields grounds for this possibility. As long as a showdown is inevitable, we should try to transform such into a constructive, creative process as a result of which the opposition and all patriots will strengthen their ranks and try to distinguish those ideological elements that are interested in quarrels, squabbles, and weakening our whole camp, pushing it towards either conformism or suicide by extremism.

The ideology of victory

The possibility of a true ideological synthesis which could perfectly unite the "Bolsheviks" and "Mensheviks", "nationalists" and "Eurasianists", and "national-communists", "national-democrats", and "ethno-centricists" is already in view. On the level of geopolitics, the opposition's ideal should be a powerful and supranational continental Empire that is sovereign on the political, strategic, and economic levels. At the level of domestic national policy, the opposition's ideal should be the full restoration of national justice for the Russian people which has been oppressed and trampled over long decades of an anti-Russian ideology. This in particular means a radical struggle to the last breath against

the Russophobic rabble which has now seized power in the country. On the level of social policy, the opposition should insist on the restoration of social justice and on the state and society caring for each of its members and providing economic guarantees to each and every one of the Great Power's citizens. Moreover, in the future the country's economic system might satisfy both national-communists (with public and state ownership of key industries) as well as the advocates of national-capitalism (with private ownership for small and medium enterprises, the promotion of private productive initiatives in industry and agriculture, etc.). The tyranny of international finance capital will be put to an end immediately after the opposition comes to power. However, all spheres of cooperation with foreign industrial enterprises that are beneficial for our state and nation will be developed. All of the opposition's members should participate in this ideological synthesis, while the only ones excluded from this process should be those who themselves want to exclude others from this all-national process and claim to be in sole possession of the truth in the final instance.

The seriousness of the situation in which the opposition finds itself today and the historic importance of our time is so great that any such stubborn criticism, denial, exclusion, pseudo-prophetism, and sectarianism – in a word, Menshevism – should be seen as “subversive activities” against Russia, the State, and the Nation. Let us not fool ourselves, for what we are living through today is a REVOLUTION. And this means that “revolution-time” and wartime laws hereby enter into force. Our words, our statements, and our articles are no longer private, individual opinions or literary, publicist polemics. We will now have to be seriously accountable for every single written and published phrase.

THE FOURTH ESTATE

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

THE FOURTH ESTATE

THE HISTORY AND MEANING OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

SCIENCE AND IDEOLOGY: A PROBLEM OF METHOD

None of the words we use in the course of social and political discussions and analyses is ideologically neutral. Outside of ideology entirely, such words lose their meaning. And it is not possible to determine one's attitude toward them unambiguously, since the content of any expression is shaped by context and semantic structures, a kind of operational system. When we live in a society with an obvious ideology, openly maintained as the dominant one, things are clear enough.

The significance of words flows directly from the ideological matrix, which is instilled through upbringing, education, and instruction and is supported by the active ideological apparatus of the state. The state forms a language, defines the meaning of discourse, and sets—most often through repressive measures, broadly understood—the limits and moral tint of the basic collection of political and sociological concepts and terms.

If we lived in a society in which communist ideology dominates, concepts such as “bourgeoisie,” “fascism,” “capitalism,” “speculation,” etc. acquire not only strictly negative connotations but specific meanings, with which capitalists, fascists, and speculators would categorically disagree. The disagreement concerns not only signs, but the very significance of words. The way a communist sees a fascist, or a capitalist seems to the fascist, might seem to a different party to be little more than a caricature or a distortion. And this, of course, works the other way around: fascism seems natural to the fascist, and communism, utterly evil.

For a capitalist, communism and fascism are equally evil. The capitalist most often does not think of himself as bourgeois. Speculation is for him a form of the realization of natural economic rights, and the system he defends he usually regards as a “free” society, an “open” society. Neither the Marxist analysis of the appropriation of surplus value, nor the fascist critique of the web of interest obligations and

payments, and the international financial oligarchy, which usurps power over peoples and nations, ever convince him of anything.

Ideologies are similar to religions; hence Carl Schmitt speaks of “political theology.” Each believes sacredly in his own values and ideals, and criticism of or apology for alternative values most often has no effect (except for a few cases of confessional change, which occurs in the history of religion and in the history of political teachings).

Consequently, before speaking seriously about one or another term, it is necessary to determine in which ideological context we will be considering it. Someone will surely object: science must take a neutral position. That is impossible. In this case, science would pretend to the status of a meta-ideology, i.e. a kind of “true ideology,” of which all other ideologies are relative forms. But nobody will agree with this, even if it should come into someone’s head to flaunt such ambitions.

In the religious sphere, syncretic teachings periodically arise, claiming that they are the expression of “absolute truth” and that all other historical religions are its relative manifestations. But as a rule, such tendencies do not enjoy great popularity, remaining the property of rather small circles and denied by major confessions as “heresies.” Science, likewise, cannot claim the status of a meta-ideology and remain relevant. But it differs from ordinary ideology by three features:

It reflects distinctly upon the structures of the ideological paradigm it considers. (Ordinary people do not even suspect that what seems to them their “personal opinion” is a secondary or even tertiary product of ideological processing, the mechanisms of which are entirely hidden from them.)

In the course of analysis of ideological discourse, it uses the techniques of classical logic (Aristotle’s laws and Leibniz’s principle of sufficient reason).

It is able to build a comparative matrix of the correspondences between diverse ideologies, juxtaposing structures in their foundations and establishing symmetries and oppositions between separate discourses and their elements.

Thus, in considering any concept or term, it is possible to proceed in two ways: either to interpret it from the position of one or another ideology, not digging into its foundations and not comparing it with other interpretations (this is the level of propaganda and low-quality applied analysis/journalism), or to attend to the scientific method, which does not free us from adherence to an ideology, but forces us to reason, observing the three above-mentioned rules of the scientific approach (paradigm, logic, comparison).

We propose to consider the concept of the “middle class” in precisely this scientific spirit.

FROM CASTE TO CLASS

The concept of the “middle class” is crucial for the liberal-capitalist ideology. Although it appeared later than the Marxist theory of class struggle and the famous communist doctrine of the two antagonistic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the very meaning of the term “middle class” has a much longer history and has its roots in the period of bourgeois revolutions and the rise of the Third Estate, which claimed henceforth a monopoly in political and economic spheres.

Before considering the “middle class,” let’s turn to the concept of “class” as such. Class is a concept of the social organization of modernity. Ancient orders and social-political systems were built on the caste principle. “Caste” should be understood as the doctrine that the inner nature of different people differs qualitatively: there are divine souls and earthly (feral, demonic) souls. The caste reflects precisely this nature of the soul, which man is not able to change during his life. The caste is fatal. The normal society, according to this conception, must be built so that those of a divine nature (the elite) are above, and those of an earthly (feral, demonic) nature remain below (the masses). That is how the Indian Varna system is arranged, as were ancient Jewish, Babylonian, Egyptian, and other societies.

This caste theory was replaced by a more flexible estate theory. The estate also proposes a difference in people’s natures (the existence of higher and lower), but here the fact of birth in one or another estate is not considered a final and natural factor in the determination of belonging to a certain social status. Estate can be changed if the representative of a lower estate accomplishes a great feat, demonstrates unique spiritual qualities, becomes a member of the priesthood, etc.

Here, alongside the caste principle, is the principle of meritocracy, that is, rewards for services. The meritocratic principle extends also to the descendants of the one who accomplished the feat (ennobling). Estate society was predominant in Christian civilization right to the end of the Middle Ages. In estate society, the highest estates are the priesthood (clergy) and the military (aristocracy), and the lowest is the Third Estate of peasants and craftsmen. Precisely the same way, in a caste society, priests and warriors (Brahma and Kshatriya) were highest, and lowest were peasants, artisans, and traders (Vaishya).

Modernity became the era of the overthrow of estate society. Europe's bourgeois revolutions demanded a replacement of the estate privileges of the higher estates (the clergy and the military aristocracy, the nobility) in favor of the Third Estate. But the bearers of this ideology were not the peasants, who were connected with traditional society by the specific character of seasonal labour, religious identity, etc., but the more mobile townspeople and burghers. "Bourgeois" is itself formed from the German word "Burg" meaning "town." Hence, modernity gave first priority to precisely the townsfolk-citizen-bourgeois as a normative unit.

The bourgeois revolutions abolished the power of the Church (clergy) and aristocracy (nobility, dynasties) and advanced the model of building society on the basis of the domination of the Third Estate, represented by the townsfolk-citizen-bourgeois. This is, essentially, capitalism. Capitalism, in its victory, replaces estate distinctions, but preserves material ones. Thus, the notion of class arises: class signifies an indicator of the measure of inequality. The bourgeoisie abolishes estate inequality, but preserves material inequality. Consequently, precisely modernity's bourgeois capitalistic society is a class society in the full sense of the word. Previously, in the Middle Ages, belonging to an estate was one's primary social attribute. In modernity, the entire social stratification was reduced to the attribute of material riches. Class is thus a phenomenon of modernity.

CLASS WAR

The class character of bourgeois society, however, was perceived most distinctly not by the ideology of the bourgeoisie, but by Marx. He elaborated his revolutionary teaching on the basis of the concept of class. At its foundation was the idea that class society and the material inequality characteristic of it, elevated to the highest criterion, exposes the essence of the nature of society, man, and history. In Marx's class picture, there are always rich and poor, and the rich always get richer, and the poor, poorer. Consequently, there are two classes, the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and their struggle is the motor and meaning of history.

All of Marxism is built on this idea: when we speak of classes, we speak of two antagonistic classes, the difference between which is not relative but absolute, since each embodies in itself two irreconcilable worlds: the world of Exploitation and the world of (honest) Labor. There are two classes: the class of Labor (the proletariat) and the class of Exploitation (the bourgeoisie). In the capitalist system, the class of Exploitation dominates. The class of Labor must become conscious of itself, arise, and overthrow the class of Exploiters. They must create, at first, the Government of Labor—socialism. Then, after the last remnants of bourgeois society have been destroyed, communist society will appear, now fully classless. According to Marx, a classlessness is possible only after the victory of the proletariat and the radical destruction of the bourgeoisie.

For Marx, a “middle class” simply cannot exist. This concept has no independent semantics in Marxist ideology, since everything that is between the bourgeoisie and proletariat (for instance, the petty bourgeoisie or prosperous peasantry) relates essentially either to the bourgeoisie or the proletariat. For Marxists, the “middle class” is a fiction. It doesn’t exist, and the concept itself is nothing but an instrument of the ideological propaganda of capitalists, trying to fool the proletariat, promising a future integration into the class of the bourgeoisie (which, according to Marx, cannot happen, since the appropriation of surplus value prevents the proletariat’s enrichment).

We can draw the following conclusion: the term “middle class” is a fiction for Marxists, an artificial figure of bourgeois ideology, called upon to conceal the real picture of society and the processes occurring in it. At the same time, Marxists admit the fact of a transition from estate society to class society and, consequently, agree with the bourgeoisie that a society of material inequalities (class society) is “more progressive” than a society of estate inequality; they disagree with the bourgeoisie in that, for communists, this is not the “end of history,” but only the beginning of a full-fledged revolutionary struggle. Liberals, on the other hand, insist that material inequality is entirely moral and justified and maintain that the communists’ striving for material equality is, by contrast, amoral and pathological. For liberals, “the end of history” begins when everyone becomes “middle class.” For communists, it begins when the proletariat finally destroy the bourgeoisie and build a communist society of total equality.

The Middle Class within Liberalism

The concept of a middle class is implicitly present in liberal ideology from the very beginning. That said, it only receives full implementation in the course of the establishment of sociology, which endeavors to combine many avant-garde theses of Marxism (in particular, the centrality of the concept of class) and bourgeois conditions. Sociology is thus a hybrid form: ideologically, it is between communism and liberalism; methodologically, it emphasizes a scientific, analytic approach. We can distinguish two poles in sociology, the social (the school of Durkheim, the theories of Sorokin, etc.) and the liberal (Weber, the Chicago and “Austrian” Schools in the United States, etc.)

In any case, the specific character of the liberal understanding of class is the conviction that, in the standard bourgeois society, there is only one class, and all differences between the depths and the heights are relative and conditional. If, for Marx, there are always two classes, and they exist in implacable enmity, for liberals (Adam Smith, for instance) there is always ultimately one class—the bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie nominally embraces the entire capitalist society. The poorest layers of this

society are, as it were, incompletely bourgeois. The richest, on the other hand, are super-bourgeois. But the social nature of all people is qualitatively identical: all are given equal starting opportunities, setting out from which the bourgeois can either reach a certain level of success, or fail to reach it and tumble down into the incompletely bourgeois.

Hence, Adam Smith takes as a standard situation the following classical liberal narrative:

The baker hires a worker, who has recently come to the city for work. After working as an assistant to the owner, the hired worker learns to bake bread and observes the organization of processes of interaction with suppliers and customers. After some time, the hired worker borrows credit and opens a bakery. After first working independently, he eventually hires a helper, who has come to the city for work, and the cycle repeats itself.

In this model, we see the following. Not only is society thought of as middle class, but there exists the already-middle-class and the not-yet-middle-class. In this picture, the hired worker does not form a peculiar type, but represents the potentially bourgeois, while the ready baker is actually bourgeois (though even he, coming to ruin, can theoretically be in the position again of the hired worker, the not-yet-bourgeois).

According to Marx, the quantity of riches in society is a fixed quantity, and the presence of two classes is based on precisely this: those who have riches will never share them with the poor, since life in capitalist society is a zero-sum game. For Smith, on the other hand, riches constantly increase. As a result, the boundaries of the middle class continuously expand. Capitalism is based on the presumption of the constant growth of riches for all members of society; ideally, all humanity must become middle class.

At the same time, there are two approaches to the middle class in liberal ideology. The first corresponds to left liberals: they demand that the super-bourgeois (the big capitalists) consciously share a part of the profits with the middle class and petty bourgeoisie, since this will lead to the stability of the system and to an acceleration of the growth of the middle class globally.

The second approach is characteristic of right liberals: they object to the burden placed on the super-bourgeoisie by taxation and welfare projects; they believe this contradicts the spirit of “free enterprise” and slows the dynamics of the development of the capitalist system, since the super-

bourgeoisie stimulates the growth of the middle-bourgeoisie, which, in turn, urges on the petty bourgeoisie and the not-yet-bourgeoisie.

Accordingly, the concept of the middle class becomes, for left liberals, a moral value and ideological slogan (as in, “We must build a stronger middle class!”). For right liberals, on the other hand, the growth of the middle class is a natural consequence of the development of the capitalist system and does not demand special attention or elevation to a value.

CLASS AS SOCIAL STRATA IN SOCIOLOGY

In sociology, this basic ideological attitude of liberalism concerning the primacy of the middle class manifests itself in the relativization of the model of stratification. Sociology divides society into three classes: upper, middle, and lower (to this is sometimes added the underclass of pure marginals and social deviants). These classes are not identical to Marxist, nor to strictly liberal class concepts (since liberalism knows only one class, the middle class, while the others are thought of as its variations). This division fixes the dimension of individuals along four indicators: material sufficiency, level of fame, position in administrative hierarchy, and level of education. On the basis of strictly qualitative criteria, any person can be related to one of three social strata.

Here, the concept of class does not have a direct ideological content, but, as a rule, it is applied to bourgeois society, where sociology as a science appeared. This sociological classes, identified with social strata, should be distinguished from Marxist classes and from standard liberal conceptions about the middle class as the universal and single class.

In this case, in a bourgeois framework, the struggle for the rights of the underclass or support of the lower class (in a sociological sense) can be thought of as a left continuation of the liberal approach: attention to the lower layer of bourgeois society stipulates striving to facilitate its integration into the middle class, i.e. to pull them up the level of the bourgeois. For right liberals, such an effort is “amoral,” since it contradicts the main principle of social freedom: initiative and honest competition (the strong win, the weak lose, but such are the rules of the game; all should endeavor to become strong). The extreme version of right or even far-right liberalism is the “objectivism” of Ayn Rand.

THE MIDDLE CLASS AND NATIONALISM

There is one other ideological system of modernity, which we have yet to consider—nationalism. Nationalism is a variation of bourgeois ideology, which insists that the standard horizon of bourgeois

society should not be humanity (the “cosmopolitanism” and “globalism” of classical liberals) but society as defined by the borders of a nation-state. The nation or people is taken as the maximal unit of integration. The market is open within the boundaries of the nation. But in the inter-state system, economic activity transitions to the level of the state, not private actors. From here, there arises the legitimization of such instruments as tariffs, protectionism, etc.

Nationalism thinks of the middle class not abstractly but concretely, as the middle class of a given national formation of the state. Nationalism also, like liberalism, accepts as a standard figure of society the townsperson-citizen-bourgeois, but puts the accent precisely on citizen, and what’s more, the citizen of a given national state.

The “nation” as a political formation becomes a synonym of bourgeois society. For nationalists, beyond this society, there exists only a zone of national and social risk. The nation is thought of here as a community of the middle class. And the task consists in integrating the lower layers into the national whole, often with the help of welfare measures. That is why nationalism can possess numerous socialist features, though the ideological basis here is different: pulling the economically weak to the level of the middle class is a task of national integration, not a consequence of orientation towards justice and material equality. We see something similar with left liberals, who consider integrating the under-class into broader society as a condition for the stability of the development of the capitalist system.

Nationalism, as a rule, relates negatively to national minorities and especially to immigrants. This is connected with the fact that in the eyes of nationalists, these elements disturb the homogeneity of the national middle class. Moreover, some national minorities are blamed for concentrating in their hands too much material wealth, in other words, those who challenge the national middle class “from above.” Nationalist feelings of injustice are expressed in antagonism towards “oligarchs” and, often times, as “economic anti-semitism,” a sentiment that was not foreign to Marx himself. In turn, other non-nationals (usually immigrants) are blamed for increasing the numbers of the lower strata and underclass, the integration of which is complicated by national differences. A variant of anti-immigrant nationalism consists in the charge that the increase of cheap labor slows the process of enriching the “native” population and the “harmonious” (for nationalists) growth of the middle class.

THE PROBLEM OF THE MIDDLE CLASS IN CONTEMPORARY RUSSIA

After making these necessary methodological refinements, we can finally raise the question: what is the middle class for Russia? What are its prospects? Is it important for us or, on the contrary, are discussions about it optional and secondary?

It is impossible to answer this without turning to one of the three classical ideologies (including the versions contained in each through the polarities of left and right).

If we take the position of right liberalism, the answer is this: we should not pay attention to the middle class; the most important thing is to secure maximum economic freedom (that is, complete removal of government from business, taxes approximating zero, etc.), and everything will fall into place. Right liberals and consistent globalists are convinced that the growth of the middle class in Russia is not the goal; it is a consequence of the nation's integration into the global economy, the opening of internal markets for external competition, and the prompt dismantling of an overbearing state.

If we take the position of left liberalism, then our attitude changes substantially. The broadening of the middle class is the number one task for our society, since the successful establishment of capitalism in Russia depends on precisely this, as does its integration into the international community. A small and weak middle class facilitates the degradation of society into "lumpens" and "oligarchs" and indirectly helps nationalistic and socialistic anti-liberal tendencies capture the minds of the population. Social injustice and inequality, the volume of the underclass, and the slow growth of the middle class demand special attention and the execution of goal-directed policies, since the fate of capitalism in Russia is at stake. Again, the struggle for the middle class is a slogan of left liberals. And they are the ones who would most likely focus this topic, since it is the core of their ideological positions.

If we are contemporary Marxists by inertia or conscious choice, then any mention of a middle class must evoke our rage, since this is the ideological platform of the sworn enemies of communism—bourgeois liberals. For communists, the following is correct: the narrower the middle class, the sharper the social contradictions and the more acute the imperative of the class struggle of proletariat against bourgeoisie. Thus, the communist perceives a large lower social strata and underclass against the background of prospering oligarchs as the ideal social picture. For communists, the middle class is a lie, an evil, and its absence or underdevelopment is a chance and window of opportunity for revolution. If some "communist" thinks otherwise, then he is not a communist, but a revisionist and compromiser with the bourgeoisie.

If we are nationalists, then the middle class acquires for us an additional dimension. It is thought of as the skeleton of national society in opposition to the "immigrant underclass" and "foreign-born oligarchy." This is the peculiar notion of the middle class in the nationalist framework. And the cutting edges of this conception of the middle class are directed against oligarchs (the upper class) and immigrants (the lower class and underclass); the middle class itself is regarded as the national class, i.e.

as the Russian class, which includes Russian entrepreneurs, Russian proprietors, the Russian bourgeoisie, etc.

It is impossible to speak of the middle class as such, without adhering (consciously or not) to an ideological position. But since in Russia, according to the constitution, there is no state ideology, theoretically we can interpret the middle class however we want. The fact that this concept has become the center of discussions attests to the fact that in contemporary Russia, by the inertia of the '90s and early 2000s, a liberal paradigm prevails. In the absence of a state ideology, liberals nevertheless strive to impose on us their paradigm as dominant.

Let's conduct a thought experiment: a discussion about the middle class is taking place in a socially significant platform, for instance on one of Russia's major television stations. Representatives of all possible ideologies of modernity are participating: Russian liberals, Russian communists, and Russian nationalists.

The first, a Russian liberal, would say:

The growth of the middle class and elevation of the level of wealth for the citizens of Russia is the main task of our society and government.

The second, a Russian communist:

Illegal privatization in the '90s put national property in the hands of oligarchs; look how our people live in the provinces in poverty and squalor!

The third, a Russian nationalist:

Illegal immigrants are taking jobs from Russians, and they're all led by Jewish and Caucasian oligarchs. That is a catastrophe for the Russian middle class!

Despite the fact that the viewers might like all three positions, the jury and “respected experts” will, undoubtedly, grant victory to the liberals. For ultimately, we still find ourselves in the condition of the ideological dictatorship of liberalism. This would happen despite the fact that society, recognizing the right of liberal discourse, fully and persistently denies its supremacy and absolute right. (In contrast, for the political elite, liberal dogmas remain sacred and unshakeable.)

From this, we can draw a conclusion: the middle class and discussion about it reflect the ideological order of liberals among Russia’s political and economic elite. If we do not share liberal axioms, then we might not consider this topic at all, or else offer an interpretation (Marxist, nationalistic, etc.) that liberals will vigorously reject.

THE FOURTH POLITICAL THEORY: BEYOND CLASS

In conclusion, we can conduct an analysis of the middle class in the context of the Fourth Political Theory. This theory is built on the imperative of overcoming modernity and all three political ideologies in order (the order has tremendous significance): (1) liberalism, (2) communism, (3) nationalism (fascism). The subject of this theory, in its simple version, is the concept “narod,” roughly, “Volk” or “people,” in the sense of “peoplehood” and “peoples,” not “masses.”

In its complex version, the subject of this theory is Heidegger’s category of Dasein. We can say, as an approximation, that narod must be thought of existentially, as the living, organic, historical presence of Russians in a qualitative spatial landscape, in the expanses of Great Russia. But if the subject is the narod and not the individual (as in liberalism), not two antagonistic classes (as in Marxism), and not the political nation (as in nationalism), then all the obligatory elements of the modern picture of the world change. There is no longer materialism, economism, recognition of the fatefulness and universality of the bourgeois revolutions, linear time, Western civilization as a universal standard, secularism, human rights, civil society, democracy, the market, or any other axioms and buzzwords of modernity. The Fourth Political Theory proposes solutions and horizons knowingly excluded by liberalism, communism, and nationalism. (More on this is found in my book *The Fourth Political Theory* and my new book *The Fourth Way*.)

On the whole, The Fourth Political Theory, when applied to the problem of the “middle class” says the following:

The transition from caste to estate and from estate to class is not a universal law. This process can occur as it did in modern Western Europe, or it can fail to occur or occur partially, as is happening today in non-Western societies. Hence, the very concept of class as applied to society has a limited applicability. Class and classes can be identified in modern Western European societies, but whether they can replace the caste inequality of the soul and human nature is not at all obvious. Western societies themselves are confident that classes do so. But an existential approach to this problematic can call this into question.

The most important thing is how the human relates to death. There are those who can look it in the face, and those who always have their backs turned to it. But the origins of the social hierarchy, the fundamental distinction between people and the superiority of some to others consists in precisely this. Material conditions are not decisive here. Hegel's interpretation of Master and Slave is based on this criterion. Hegel thinks that the Master is the one who challenges death, who steps out to encounter it. Acting in this way, he does not acquire immortality, but he acquires a Slave, one who runs from death, lacking the courage to look it in the eye. The Master rules in societies where death stands at the center of attention. The Slave acquires political rights only where death is bracketed and removed to the periphery. So long as death remains in society's field of vision, we are dealing with rule by the wise and heroic, philosophers and warriors. This is caste society or estate society. But not class society. Where class begins, life ends, and the alienated strategies of reification, objectivation, and mediation prevail.

Hence, the Fourth Political Theory thinks that the construction of society on the basis of the criterion of property is a pathology. The fate of man and narod is history and geography—but in no way economics, the market, or competition.

The Fourth Political Theory rejects class as a concept and denies its relevance for the creation of a political system based on the existential understanding of the narod. Even more so does it reject the concept of the "middle class," which reflects the very essence of the class approach. The middle class, like the middle (that is, average) person, is a social figure situated at the point of maximal social illusion, at the epicenter of slumber. The representative of the middle class corresponds to Heidegger's figure of *das Man*, the generalized bearer of "common sense," which is subject to no verification or examination. (*Das Man* is often translated into English as "The They," in the sense of "They say so-and-so will win the election this year...") *Das Man* is the greatest of illusions.

The middle, average person is not at all the same as the normal person. "Norm" is a synonym for "ideal," that to which one should strive, that which one should become. The middle person is a person in the least degree, the most ex-individual of individuals, the most null and barren quality. The middle person isn't a person at all; he is a parody of a person. He is Nietzsche's "Last Man." And he is deeply

abnormal, since for a normal person, it is natural to experience horror, to think about death, to acutely experience the finitude of being, to call into question—sometimes tragically insoluble—the external world, society, and relations to another.

The middle class doesn't think; it consumes. It doesn't live; it seeks security and comfort. It doesn't die, it blows out like a car tire (it emits its spirit, as Baudrillard wrote in *Symbolic Exchange and Death*). The middle class is the most stupid, submissive, predictable, cowardly, and pathetic of all classes. It is equally far from the blazing elements of poverty and the perverted poison of incalculable wealth, which is even closer to hell than extreme poverty. The middle class has no ontological foundation for existing at all, and if it does, then only somewhere far below, beneath the rule of the philosopher-kings and warrior-heroes. It is the Third Estate, imagining about itself that it is the one and only. This is an unwarranted pretension. Modernity and capitalism (in the sense of the universality of the middle class) is nothing more than a temporary aberration. The time of this historical misunderstanding is coming to an end.

Thus, today, when the agony of this worst of possible social arrangements still continues, you must look beyond capitalism. At the same time, we must value and take interest in both what preceded it, the Middle Ages, and in that which will come after it and that which we must create—a New Middle Ages.

Translated by Michael Millerman

<http://www.radixjournal.com/journal/2014/6/9/the-fourth-estate>

The Fourth Political Theory and the Italian Logos

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The Fourth Political Theory and Julius Evola's Traditionalism

The Italian publication of *The Fourth Political Theory* has great significance for me. That is above all connected with the fact that my views were formed under the decisive influence of the philosophy of traditionalism, one of the two pillars of which (alongside René Guénon) is the Italian philosopher Julius Evola. On the whole, my views are completely based on traditionalism, though I prefer not to repeat the formulas and statements of its founders, but, proceeding from its principles, to develop conceptions and theories in those domains that for some reason or other were not priorities for the founders of traditionalism. Nevertheless, precisely traditionalism lies at the basis of all my investigations, to whichever sphere they might relate: philosophy, religion, politics, geopolitics, sociology, international relations, the history of civilizations and ideas, etc.

Since Evola was Italian, a school of supporters decisively influenced by his ideas naturally formed in Italy. For that group of readers, many aspects of "*The Fourth Political Theory*" will, I hope, be rather fully comprehensible and familiar. The main issue is the juxtaposition of the paradigm of Modernity and the paradigm of Tradition. The Three Political Theories, on the overcoming of which the Fourth Political Theory is based, belong entirely to the paradigm of Modernity. Their alternative, the Fourth Political Theory itself, appeals to the paradigm of Tradition. Essentially, the Fourth Political Theory can fully be regarded as a strategy of Revolt against the modern world, applied to the political-ideological circumstances of the 21st century.

But on the other hand, there are a number of fundamental points that diverge from classical Evolism and in part from traditionalism as such. The most fundamental of them seem to me to be these:

1. Rejection of the individual as the basis of liberalism. This contrasts with the works of Evola (especially the early ones) in which he develops a teaching concerning the "Absolute Individual." Here, incidentally, the problem is terminological: I mean by "individual" the concept of the rational-material person of Modernity, as Anglo-Saxon philosophy and contemporary sociology (especially Dumont) think of him.

The “individual” is the atomic ego, completely closed off to any transcendental dimensions. It is obvious that Evola means something entirely different by “individual,” and all the more so by the “absolute” individual. He uses this term as a synonym of the Hindu Atman, which has no relation at all to the individual of liberalism or Modernity. In the Western tradition, one might speak of the “person.” If we adopt this correction, the contradiction disappears.

2. Specification of the correlation between Dumézil’s three functions (or three higher castes) and the three estates of Western European history. If no problems arise in regard to the homology priest – Brahman (first caste) and warrior (aristocracy) – Kshatriya (I bypass the question of Evola’s polemics with Guenon concerning the dialectical relationship between the two higher castes), then the identification of the third caste, the third function (Vaishya) with the bourgeoisie and the third estate is much more problematic (and even, in my opinion, incorrect). According to my investigations, set forth in detail in the book *Ethnosociology*, the third caste (Vaishya) in traditional society is peasants and cattle-breeders in nomadic societies, but not at all the urban bourgeoisie or the class of buyers and traders. That is, the similarity between the third caste and the Third Estate is purely external. In fact, the bourgeoisie as a class is formed on the basis of those social groups that were altogether removed beyond the limits of caste society or occupied a role of layers lower than the peasants. They were craftsmen, musicians, blacksmiths, and servants. The bourgeoisie was formed from servants of warriors (the second caste), who were too cowardly to fight and too lazy to work in the fields. This was originally the class of parasites and liars, who usurped the intermediary functions between the second and third caste. These are armor-bearers or lackeys, like Don Quixote’s Sancho Panza or the servants of the musketeers in Dumas’s novel. For precisely that reason the bourgeoisie (and the liberal ideology characteristic of it) emerged victorious from the battle with communism: that was the victory not of the third function over the fourth, but of global refuse, vampire bankers, and parasites. Accordingly, I propose to reconsider also the “proletariat.” Of course, in itself the proletariat is a bourgeois conception, developed already after the world of the urban bourgeoisie began to acquire the mature contours of Modern civilization. The urban parasite-bourgeoisie constituted its antipode, its antithesis. But the social genesis of the urban proletariat clearly indicates that it represents the ravished or impoverished representatives of the third function (peasants, Vaishya), i.e., that it stands higher on the caste ladder than traders or craftsmen. Of course, under urban circumstances of bourgeois exploitation it gradually loses these signs of carrying the values of traditional society, but its opposition to the bourgeoisie is not the revolt of the lower against the higher, but a striving to return the usurper-capitalists to their proper place – under the boot of legal caste power. Of course, that is absent from classical Marxism, but in the historical practice of the Bolshevik revolution and especially in the experience of the socialist regimes of China, Korea, Vietnam, Campuchia, or Burma, it is completely evident. “Proletarian” revolutions were victorious only in those countries where there was practically no industrial urban proletariat. It was essentially the revenge of the laboring peasantry (including those that had been put out of business) against the caste bourgeois usurpers. From here arises the placement of the Second Political Theory over the First Political Theory. This contradicts Evola’s ideas, especially

from the post-war period (“Orientations”), when he allowed the possibility of an alliance of traditionalists with anti-communist bourgeois movements.

3. The Interpretation of Heidegger. I adhere to an entirely different interpretation of Martin Heidegger’s ideas than Evola does in his book *Ride the Tiger*. From my perspective, Heidegger stands much closer to traditionalism than seems at first glance, although his ideas can appear rather difficult to understand. In speaking of Dasein, Heidegger reveals that human element [chelovecheskoye nachalo] that precedes conceptual superstructures and conjoins the human with powerful and primordial elements [stikhiyami]: death, time, the world, anxiety, etc. In the Fourth Political Theory, Dasein plays the role of the “subject” and all of the metaphysics are developed from that point, on its basis. It is easy to see in this the immanent themes of tantric initiation, which insists on the utmost specifics of human and superhuman transformations. Heidegger calls his philosophy “fundamental ontology,” i.e. a teaching [ucheniye] about being, built on an indissoluble connection with Dasein. That is entirely similar to Evola’s critique of Western European idealism. I acknowledge that Evola and Heidegger were on different waves and did not agree with each other, but they are equally close to me. Moreover, I regard both authors as precursors of the Fourth Political Theory, the prerequisites for which they created, in particular by their criticism of Third Political Theory, to which both had a certain relation for a period of time.

Other differences, including Evola’s hostility towards Christianity (the originator of the “Fourth Political Theory” is a convinced Orthodox Christian) or certain of his theses in defense of racism (the originator of the “Fourth Political Theory” is a convinced opponent of all forms of racism), are less important, since they are explained either by personal preferences or historico-cultural conditions.

On the whole, the Fourth Political Theory – even if with certain reservations – should be close to traditionalism since it continues the line of radical criticism of Modernity but proposes new paths and new strategies for the irreconcilable struggle.

Cultural Anthropology

But the traditionalist milieu is far from exhausting the audience to which the “Fourth Political Theory” appeals. Theoretically one could approach it from any position: by recognizing the exhaustion and dead-end of liberalism, communism, or nationalism. In regards to liberalism, one could pay attention to the principle of freedom, which liberals defend. Of course, if we attend to the history of the philosophy of liberalism, it will quickly be clear that this is an altogether particular freedom, purely negative (“freedom from”) and bearing within itself a rigid and obtrusive nihilism. However, this is clear only to the “highest

initiates" of liberalism, who recognize and adopt the devilish strategy of liberalism, directed at the complete destruction in the human of every human element. For such "liberal initiates," the satanism, totalitarianism, and destructiveness of this ideology are obvious and acceptable. Although this is most often concealed from outsiders.

After all, most liberals are not among the initiated and therefore take the values of freedom seriously. In this case they can full well raise the question why contemporary liberalism acquires ever more totalitarian features, permitting the freedom "to be a liberal" but demonizing all those who reject liberalism. Thus, in the era of globalization liberalism demonstrates the same totalitarian features as characterized its adversaries, the two other political theories, communism and fascism. An "honest liberal" (if they exist) cannot help but ask at some point whether such totalitarian is adequate and compatible with the value of freedom. Precisely here the thesis concerning the Fourth Political Theory becomes extremely relevant. Usually liberals deal with this difficulty by comparing liberalism to the Second and Third Political Theories. They say that even if liberalism is not perfect, then in any case it is better and provides more freedom than communism or fascism. That is true. But only if we agree to limit the domain of comparison to the three political theories. The Fourth Political Theory rejects liberalism, but it also rejects communism and fascism. Consequently, the principle of comparison changes. The Fourth Political Theory defends neither communism, nor fascism, nor their synthesis. It rejects political Modernity as such. And if liberals are consistent in their defense of freedom, then why should they not recognize the right of the Fourth Political Theory to exist – as a new opponent of liberalism, as a new critical theory of the 21st century?

Moreover, the Fourth Political Theory, in complete agreement with cultural anthropology and based on it (Boas, Levi-Strauss, and others), affirms the multiplicity of cultures and the impossibility of establishing any sort of hierarchy among them; hence the dogmatic and radical antiracism of the Fourth Political Theory. What's more, the Fourth Political Theory uncovers the racism contained in liberalism as a product of the historical development of Western European civilization. Focusing on the right of a people, society, civilization, or tribe to have its own proper system of values and to build its political structures on its own traditions, the Fourth Political Theory defends the maximum scope of freedom. That is, if we compare liberalism not with communism and fascism, but with the Fourth Political Theory, the Fourth Political Theory will look like a teaching [ucheniye] about freedom compared to a racist version of totalitarian globalism, embodied in the dominance of the West.

We can examine the Fourth Political Theory as an embodiment of the ethics of Boas and Levi-Strauss, as well as certain postmodern philosophers, who criticized liberalism harshly precisely for its Western Euro-American ethnocentrism.

Besides, the natural development of liberalism, which is consistently destroying all forms of collective identity – from religious and estate identity to national and gender identity – is entering the last phase of its strategy, the era of post-humanism or trans-humanism. That means that in the near future artificial intelligence, cyborgs, chimeras, hybrids, and the most diverse post-human forms of life will become everyday things. And that will complete the process of the “de-humanization” of humanity, already contained in the materialistic and rationalistic paradigm of Modernity. Among a certain number of liberals, too, who, unlike the satanic apex of globalists, are not yet for such a turn of history, all this can raise the suspicion that something is not right with this ideology.

So we cannot at all exclude the possibility that not only those waging a (hopeless) struggle against the modern world (mortally tired of it and its hopelessness) but also those who are only now recognizing the other side of the liberal ideology and starting to look for alternatives will turn to the Fourth Political Theory. The Fourth Political Theory, being adogmatic and open, does not so much offer such an alternative as prepare the soil for it and invite everyone to its construction, both those who rejected Modernity from the start and those who succumbed to its spell or inertia but, finding themselves face to face with the abyss, woke up at the last minute and understood, like the hero of “Twin Peaks,” that “something went wrong...”

The Fourth Political Theory and the Left: Preve, Cacciari, Agamben

And finally, the Fourth Political Theory addresses [or appeals to] the Italian leftists. In Italy we already have the precedent of a convergence between traditionalists and Eurasianists in the leftist philosopher Costanzo Preve (1943-2013), who recognized the need for a common right-left front against globalization, American hegemony, and liberal dominance. But that is not all. If we examine leftist anti-capitalist tendencies in Italian philosophy, we easily find authors who are rather close in mood and attitude to the Fourth Political Theory. The crisis of Marxist thought is obvious, and Marx’s anti-capitalist ethics, in itself entirely justified, can no longer be based on a dogmatic apparatus that has completely lost all its relevance under new circumstances. Moreover, revisionists among Euro-communists have practically ceded their positions in favor of the First Political Theory, becoming instruments in the hands of liberals and their System.

In this sense we can mention two leftist Italian philosophers whose thought has not become stuck in the old schemas, but who did not cede their positions to liberals: Massimo Cacciari and Giorgio Agamben.

Massimo Cacciari combines the horizon of communist hope with the angelic nature of man, the disclosure of which is the goal of the revolution. Cacciari systematically develops these ideas in his programmatic work *The Necessary Angel*, and also in other texts connected one way or another with angelology.[1]

Another original feature of Cacciari's philosophy that is also unusual, given tendencies toward universalism among leftists, is his interest in geopolitics and the geography of civilizations, i.e. geophilosophy or geosophy.[2] Cacciari pays great attention to differences among cultures and identities, proposing to interpret each of them on the basis of their inner criteria. In this he follows the cultural anthropology of Boas and the sociology of Dumont. In his study of the geosophy of Europe, Cacciari introduces the notion of the "Archangel of Europe," underscoring thereby the mosaic variety of diverse European regions. In this heightened attention toward the mosaic structure of the whole we can see a typical Italian trait: Italy is formed of a few independent and self-contained politeiae, so it would be completely fitting to apply Cacciari's concept to it: The Archangel of Italy.

According to Agamben, the European democracies of Modernity are veiled forms of dictatorship, structurally identical to the sovereign forms of power described in Hobbes's *Leviathan* or Carl Schmitt's theory of the Political. Parliamentarianism and the Constitution, according to Agamben, merely conceal the dictatorial nature of power in the Modern era, which is revealed whenever democracy encounters a more or less serious challenge. Democracy's veil disappears in an instant, and in its place the true nature of the political structure of Modernity appears: the concentration camp. The dispersion of the vertical of power in contemporary bourgeois Republics is an illusion. In fact, bourgeois society is strictly totalitarian and is governed by the principle of the power axis. According to Agamben, that is what comprises the nature of the Political: the Political is either vertical, or it doesn't exist. Attempts to find a compromise through the distribution of the decision throughout the entire space of civil society are doomed: as soon as that very action acquires a political character, the principle of radical exclusion and hierarchical subordination comes into play; this is immediately apparent in the selectivity of the allotment of rights, and in their quantity and quality. Despite the main thesis of liberalism, the subject of the Political cannot, Agamben asserts, be the individual. At its opposite end, at its extreme periphery (between society and nature), the Political constitutes not the citizen, but "bare life" (*nuda vita*).[3] That is the central concept of Agamben's philosophy, which he developed based on research on the chronicles of prisoners in prison camps in Nazi Germany and in the period of the Second World War.[4] The population of the prison camp is not people, but mass "bare life." And precisely here the scope and nature of Agamben's biopolitics is revealed: power always deals with an unqualified biomass, into which it sovereignly instills a radically heterogeneous vertical. That which was open in Nazism is veiled in democracy. But the essence remains strictly identical. Any regime of political Modernity is deeply totalitarian, whether that is fascism, communism, or liberalism, Agamben asserts. "Civil society" is only a euphemism for "bare life"; the citizen, as liberals understand him, simply does not exist. Thus arises Agamben's irrevocable triad, undeviatingly present in all the types of Modern political regimes: the

Political / Leviathan / Sovereignty (the state of exception) – society / concentration camp – bare life (the object of biopolitics).

Agamben's critique of liberalism, just like in the case of Costanzo Preve and in part of Massimo Cacciari, comes very close to the domain of the Fourth Political Theory, which is also built on a radical rejection of political Modernity. And since the sole relevant and dominant form of political Modernity today is liberalism, the first political theory, the exposure of its totalitarian nature and violent practices becomes the main practical task of a new type of political Revolution.

In 1990, on the eve of the collapse of the USSR, Agamben himself published the programmatic text *The Coming Community*, in which he described the reality of liberal totalitarianism and proposed a revolutionary alternative. Agamben interprets this totalitarianism on the basis of Guy Debord's ideas of "the society of the spectacle." Society, based on the principle of mass communications, gradually changed proportions: there are no more messages [soobshcheniy] in communication, since a referential basis has been lost. It is henceforth not the totality of discourses but a sterile and totalitarian recycling of language as such. In the case of liberalism totalitarianism, violence is carried out not by the leader or ruling group, but by the Political itself, as the concentrated expression of alienation, expressed in the complete exteriorization of language.

Noting the triumph of completed liberalism over its traditional opponents – fascism and communism – Agamben defines a new enemy, the "planetary petty-bourgeoisie" as the sole class of a post-class society.

Agamben sees in the dominance of the petty-bourgeoisie, whom liberal ideologists, Fukuyama in particular, optimistically pronounced "the end of history," not so much the accomplishment of the highest point of progress as the inevitably approaching moment of suicide. He writes, "the planetary petty-bourgeoisie is probably the form in which humanity is moving toward its own self-destruction."

The main features of Agamben's analysis coincide with the Fourth Political Theory in its leftist formulation, and here it is in complete solidarity with Costanzo Preve and Massimo Cacciari. Agamben is even closer to the Fourth Political Theory when he approaches the description of the alternative and the definition of its subject. It is worth noting that Agamben follows Heidegger in many respects, having attended his seminars in the 1960s. He comes right up to the theme of *Dasein* as the new pole of eschatological politics.[5] He introduces the concept of the "any" [lyubogo, the "whatever-singularity,"] the Latin *quodlibet*. He gives it the status of a "new subject," distinct from both the "each" (the serial,

the typical), the “all” (the mechanical sum), and the “species” (the conception, the class). Agamben emphasizes in the term *quodlibet* the presence of the word *libet*, which shares the same root at the Russian *lyubov'* or German *Liebe* [love]. Agamben sees in this a loving [*lyubovno*]-volitional uncertainty, additionally and imperceptibly (like a nimbus) present in things or beings that are completely described and fixed in all respects, except in this dimension, in both their materiality and place in the rational structure. Having subordinated to itself bare life in the form of the planetary petty-bourgeoisie and having usurped the entire array of alienated language, which no longer communicates anything (information society as the society of the total spectacle, according to Debord), liberal totalitarianism is not powerful over this subtle element, which is not an individual (as totalitarian as any political concept), but something nimble, delicate, and indefinite. According to Agamben, it is that single and ultimate [or finite] [instance] that must be opposed to the Global Liberal State, and, accordingly, to the World Government.

The Fourth Political Theory and Populism

The last thing I'd like to mention is the relation of the Fourth Political Theory to the phenomenon of populism. Lately the most diverse authors are paying attention to the phenomenon of populism. Among others, it worth singling out the fine and profound study *The Populist Moment* by the French philosopher Alain de Benoist, one of the founders of the Fourth Political Theory.[6] They all record the end of the traditional division of the political spectrum into left and right and the appearance of a new geometry of political systems. The departure from right and left is characteristic for all society, both elites and masses. It is connected with the total dominance of the First Political Theory. When liberalism acquires total hegemony, it begins to act as such, without formulation into a left or right form. In economics, right approaches dominate (market); in politics, left ones do (libertarianism, gender politics, the blending of sexes and peoples, multiculturalism, etc.). Liberalism is an elite ideology, and we increasingly see the apex of the liberal network, those same “liberal initiates” who no longer conceal their true plans and openly proclaim a path towards the post-humanization of humanity. Moreover, the methods of government become ever more openly totalitarian, using the means of mass information and social networks for forceful intrusions into the consciousness of liberal dogmatists.

On the opposite pole of society, protest attitudes are gradually accumulating that, just like the ideology of the elite, are no longer left or right. Those who reject liberalism most often do not think about a positive alternative: they reject the status quo, which in their eyes is becoming unacceptable and unbearable. At the same time, opponents of the elite lack an ideological platform, while those powers that express these attitudes in politics most often also do not follow any strictly defined programs. These protest attitudes and their spontaneous and non-systematized expression received the name “populism.” Populism has always existed, but precisely today it is becoming a most important political factor. That is precisely the “populist moment,” according to Benoist.

Here we should pay attention to the term on which the concept of populism is based, *populus*. *Populus*, *narod* [people], is a conception lacking its own exact legal status in the ideology of Modernity but present in the majority of modern Constitutions, as the source of legitimate power. The *narod* [people] mentioned in Constitutions is interpreted in legal models in a liberal way (as the totality of individuals – from which there is one step to a theory of human rights), in a national way (as the totality of citizens, who have citizenship in some country), or in a socialistic way (as class society, in regimes of popular democracy). But everywhere the *narod* [people] acts as a general conditional expression, not as a concept. That is, it is acknowledged as a subject.

That happened historically in the transition from the Renaissance to Modernity. The *narod* remains in Constitutions from the Renaissance, where it had an independent conceptual significance not yet subjected to interpretation in any of the political theories of Modernity. That is why the *narod* does not belong to the political structures of Modernity; it is found on the border: present in the Constitution but absent as a full-fledged legal subject.

The Fourth Political Theory treats the concept “*narod*” as an independent legal and philosophical category, beyond its interpretations in the context of the three political theories of Modernity. But the “*narod*” is understood existentially, as *Dasein*. Heidegger’s formula “*Dasein existiert völkisch*” is key. The Fourth Political Theory understands the *narod*, the *populus*, as *Dasein*, *Volk als Dasein*. That makes the phenomenon of populism not indistinct, chaotic, and spontaneous, but deeply grounded, philosophical, and avant-garde. In this case, the Fourth Political Theory can be regarded as a “*metaphysics of populism*,” explaining its appearance and supplying the blind protest of humanity against the satanic elite that has seized power over it with a strategy, consciousness, thought, a system, and a plan of struggle.

To conclude this preface to the Italian edition, I want to emphasize: the Fourth Political Theory appeals to everyone – to traditionalists, socialists, liberals, conservatives, persons with convictions and persons without convictions. It is an invitation to think, and not the imposition of ready-made judgments or models. Our goal is to awaken in Italian society an interest towards political philosophy, towards ideas and towards an acute – truly Italian – perception of reality.

I admire Italy, or more precisely the many societies, cultures, peoples, and states comprising the history of Italy from the Etruscans and Roman Empire to the Vatican and Risorgimento. I dedicated a separate book to the “*Latin Logos*,” where I expressed my love for the Italian spirit and for the beauty of dramatic and elevated Italian thought.

The publication of the Fourth Political Theory in Italian is an important event in my life.

[1] Massimo Cacciari, *L'Angelo necessario* (Milano: Adelphi, 1986); Massimo Cacciari, *Adolf Loos e il suo angelo* (Milano: Electa, 1981).

[2] Massimo Cacciari, *Geophilosophy of Europe*. (SPB: Pneuma, 2004).

[3] Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[4] Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive* (New York: Zone Books, 2002).

[5] Dugin, *The Fourth Way* (Moscow, 2014).

[6] Alain de Benoist, *Droite-gauche, c'est fini! Le Moment Populiste* (Pierre-Guillaume De Roux, 2017)

The Fourth Political Theory and the Problem of the Devil

September 10, 2017

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Geopolitica.ru/en

Clarifying the nature of 4PT

The Fourth Political Theory (4PT) is a conceptual matrix which describes the possibility of an alternative to the political tendency that became dominant in the epoch of modernity.

The three main political ideologies of the epoch of modernity, which include liberalism (the first political theory), communism (the second political theory), and nationalism (the third political theory) in effect exhausted and embodied different aspects of the modern paradigm of political philosophy.

These political concepts clashed with one another in the 20th century and determined the structure of the world wars, the Cold War, alliances, unions, etc. If the First World War was a clash between a number of major national European powers, then the Second World War exhibited a conflict between all three ideological forces: liberals in the face of the West (the US and England), communists in the face of the USSR, and Nazis/fascists in the face of Mussolini's Italy and Hitler's Germany, and other closely-related movements.

Accordingly, after the third political theory (fascism and National Socialism) suffered defeat, two political theories remained – the first and the second – and confronted each other in the Cold War until the first political theory (liberalism) beat the second (communism) in 1989 and particularly in 1991.

Three versions of modernity

The entire history of modernity passed under the sign of these three political theories which embodied the very matrix, the very paradigm of modern political philosophy. All of them were built according to the logic of the political philosophy of the Mother – all of them were materialistic, evolutionist, progressivist, and all of them considered the structure of the earth to be from the bottom up, not the top down, i.e., built on the foundations of an immanent materialist doctrine.

As follows, the order of these theories' appearance and the order of their disappearance (or marginalization) also reflected a certain logic insofar as the battle between these three political theories was a fight over which of them was most consistent with the paradigm of modernity.

These three versions of modernity fought amongst each other over the most important conclusion. At stake was discovering which of these ideologies embodied the essence of modernity. Communism claimed this and believed that it would come after the liberals; liberalism itself claimed this, believing itself to be an expression of modernity as such, while – this is an important point – nationalism (fascism, National Socialism) also claimed this and considered itself a revolutionary doctrine reflecting the spirit of modernity, albeit in a different context, in different proportions, and with different guiding values than liberalism and communism.

The liberals' victory: the first became last

At any rate, all three of these ideologies fought so that one of them could embody the spirit of modernity. Each of these ideologies believed that it was modernity. After the defeat of Nazism, two ideologies, liberalism and communism, were left vying for the right to embody modernity, but after 1989-1991 it turned out that only one ideology had won this lengthy struggle – liberalism.

In other words, only one of the paradigm of modernity's three ideologies was genuinely paradigmatic. Tied to this is the process of globalization and the universalization of liberal ideology which has become the only global ideology today, having won according to the "results" of history.

Herein is also revealed the connection to Francis Fukuyama's assertion of the end of history. The "end of history" meant the victory of liberalism not as one of three ideologies, but as the ideology of modernity overall.

The atoms attack

Capitalism (liberalism) considered itself to be the embodiment of modernity from the very beginning, but this was not obvious to everyone besides liberalism's proponents themselves. This claim was challenged by both communists and fascists, and in principle was not even entirely clear for several centuries. There was always the possibility of a different pivot in history, and communism seriously claimed that it was the epitome of modernity as the "end of history" as opposed to liberalism.

Only at the end of the 20th century was the unconditional matrix of world political history decided as the spirit of modernity won in the form of liberalism. Liberalism defended its right to be not only one ideology, but the Ideology with a capital letter. Thus, it is the first and last political theory of modernity. It was with the victory of liberalism that we reached the political philosophy of post-modernity. After all, it is the domination of the individual as an atom that allows for the transition to the subatomic level.

Modernity, having won in the face of liberalism, transitioned into post-modernity as the next, post-liberal stage. But this was possible only thanks to all forms of collective identity – those predominate in the second political theory (communism) and the third political theory (Nazism) – being abolished.

Liberals assert the individual to be the last atomic and credible ontological form of being. The individual as an atom became the anthropological foundation upon which liberalism was built. Yet only after the victory of this ideology and the triumph of the individual – expressed in the ideologies of civil society, human rights, globalization, the global liberal capitalist market (the transition from global politics to global economics entailing the end of history, as Fukuyama wrote) – only at this moment did the door to post-modernity really open.

Once the atom is affirmed as the main point of being, then all further movement turns towards the subatomic level. The phenomenology of political post-philosophy, or the political philosophy of post-modernity, is linked to this.

Thus, without the victory of liberalism, the victory of post-modernism would have been impossible. Political post-modernity is based on the accomplished absolute of liberal ideology, the first political theory which completely defeated the second and third.

It is in this approximate context that global society now finds itself. Global society is not yet a reality, but a project, that of the “global West.” When we speak of the West, we understand it not as the geographical West but, for example, as including even Japan and China’s Pacific coast where Western models in economics, culture, and society are predominant as well as some countries in the Pacific region which are following the Western path of development. In other words, the West is a global concept. Of course, the West has not fully penetrated the flesh and blood of all of the societies, peoples, and civilizations of the earth, but it is nonetheless in the process of penetrating them. The West is the process of globalization, post-modernization, and the expansion of Euro-American/Euro-Atlantic culture across the entire planet.

Today’s agenda for global processes in politics accordingly entails the domination and affirmation of the victory of liberalism on a global scale, the liquidation of nation-states (what we are seeing in Europe), and the destruction of all forms of collective identity (such as nation, religion, gender).

The transition from modernity to post-modernity: the highway

The question arises: is there any alternative to this process? Let us recall that the global political process today itself represents a transition from the political philosophy of modernity (in the form of victorious liberal ideology) to post-modernity. This is the agenda of Western society today.

To what extent is this agenda universal? This question is very complicated. The West thinks of itself as global (globalization is, after all, the spread of the West’s “stain” to all space). Therefore, the question at hand is the extent to which we are a modern society and are undergoing modernization and Westernization and to what extent we are part of the European world or Euro-Atlantic civilization. All other nations too, after all, practically silently accept the imperative of modernization and recognize the West as global destiny, even as the fate of non-Western peoples and societies. If we unreservedly recognize the West as universal, then we are left with accepting the first political theory and its scale which, in the current moment, means recognizing the transition from political modernity to political post-modernity as fate, and through this lens assessing the processes occurring in our society.

In this case, we acquire a normative model for comparing and assessing everything that is happening in Russia on the basis of how much everything resembles the West, according to which the more homosexuals we have in government, the more Western, modernized, and progressive of a country we

are. The more tolerance and purely individual and even post-individual identities we have in society, the more elements we have tying us closer to the West and making us part of this universal process.

At the heart of the matter, the proposal to modernize Russian society means the final entrenchment of liberalism in our society and the transition to post-modernity. The universalism of the West and the ideological process prevailing therein (the triumph of the first political theory and the transition to the post-atomic society of post-modernity) are thereby tacitly recognized as an axiom and dogma.

The West acts globally and, as follows, all societies (even non-Western ones) are under its influence. This vector is embedded in the global agenda. Insofar as we are part of a global world, it is also on the agenda of Russian politics (as well as Chinese, Indian, and Islamic politics, the latest manifestations of modernization and democratization of which we have seen and are still observing in the violence of Wahhabis in Libya, Egypt, Syria, Iraq, etc.). The civil wars in Libya, Syria, and Ukraine are in fact forms of such modernization featuring death as a means of modernizing, especially since the political philosophy of post-modernity is openly nihilistic and dissipative. In essence, it is a philosophy of death. The philosophy of civil society, brought to its logical conclusion with the absence of the state, order, vertical authority, and any other common elements and values, leads to human loneliness reaching such an extent that nothing besides the death of one's self or a loved one can entertain human beings.

The dispute over rate and trajectory

As a matter of course, there are people in the world who, looking at what is happening before them, feel some kind of, to put it mildly, uneasiness. The Fourth Political Theory is based on the observation that "something not right" is happening in a global sense – something wrong with the very foundation of the society in which we live today.

4PT begins with a distancing from the self-evident processes unfolding on a global scale. 4PT is a result of disagreement with the course of change and the internal evolution of these political paradigms. The 4PT's first move is radically rejecting liberalism and its post-modern, somehow already post-liberal subatomic version which has become today's political mainstream.

But this rejection is coupled in 4PT with a clear understanding of that fact that both communism and fascism today are, firstly, incorporated into liberalism in a withdrawn form and, secondly, are no longer real alternatives for two fundamental reasons:

1. The second and third political theories historically lost to liberalism (on the level of political philosophy they were less consistent with the pure paradigm of the political philosophy of modernity than liberalism);

2. The second and third political theories were products of the political philosophy of modernity, which means that even if they had won, they would still ultimately express the matrix of the political philosophy of the Mother.

In fact, if communism would have claimed victory over liberalism and therein demonstrated that it is the communist paradigm that is the most modern and therefore only through communism can post-modernity be entered, then it would have led to approximately the same paradigmatic results which we face now. Even if fascism had won on a global scale, sooner or later, insofar as it is also an ideology of modernity, it would have led to the same consequences which lie at the heart of the common materialist approach.

Racism and the West

One of the characteristic attributes of National Socialist ideology was racism. Yet racism was originally part of the early liberal worldview characteristic of the epoch of Anglo-Saxon colonial conquest. In fact, racism in its cultural (not biological) form has won on a global scale today as the West has imposed its own criteria on the whole world, declaring its values to be universal and demanding that its interests be recognized as universal.

In the context of the domination of liberalism, however, Atlanticist, pro-American fascism is only a secondary, sub-liberal element. Imagine, relatively speaking, that if Hitler had won the proportion would only be different – racism would be the dominant element and liberalism latent or sub-fascist.

In short, hypothetically speaking, if other political ideologies had won the battle for the essence of modernity, then they would have nonetheless expressed the same paradigm that liberalism does today.

“No” to post-modernity

4PT proceeds from encouraging humans, groups, peoples, civilizations, and religions to say “no” to post-modernity whose matrix is liberalism. The question therein arises: if you are not a liberal, then who are you? A communist? Or perhaps an adherent of the third political theory?

In other words, critical distance in relation to the basic “trend” of today on the level of political philosophy naturally brings us to the second and third political theories or to their mix – National Bolshevism. All of this would indeed be in opposition to liberalism, but nevertheless within the framework set by modernity.

Thus, our opposition to liberalism once again inevitably ends up appealing to peripheral forms of modernity. In this case, we merely declare that we do not like the essence of modernity in its pure form (liberalism) and stand in opposition to modernity from its periphery. This is conservatism. It offers only to “slow down” modernity while still moving in the same trajectory towards the same goal, only significantly slower. And here is what we get: once we stand at a distance from the dominant “trend”, the political philosophy of post-modernity, as only the result of the global rule of the first political theory (liberalism), then we are but “modernist conservatives.”

Even within liberal circles, there are vanguard-minded liberals who rejoice at the transition to post-modernity like those who say: “Perhaps not so fast, not so quickly, shall we slow down?” Consequently, all three political ideologies of modernity in view of the “vision of the future”, the face of post-modernity, can stand on conservative positions. Communism and fascism are themselves conservative in view of liberalism in any form. Liberal conservatism exists to the extent to which liberals fear the ultimate expression of their own ideological platform.

Nevertheless, today humanity is moving, “drifting” towards post-modernity. There are those who understand that this is not only too fast of a current, but that this current is not flowing “there”, but in a bad direction. The “river” should flow back. This is the point of 4PT.

The murderous mother

The essence of 4PT lies in that it rejects not only one of the political ideologies of the epoch of modernity, but all of them. The three political theories exhausted the spectrum of what modernity has

to offer. 4PT tells them “no” and is discontent with the flow of the river in the direction of the political philosophy of the Mother.

4PT is a theory of global, absolute, and radical Revolution aimed not only against the domination of the West in particular, against the current state of European civilization, the hegemony of the United States of America, or liberalism, but against modernity itself, against the political paradigm of the Logos of the Great Mother, against the metaphysics in which the world is viewed from the bottom up.

Here is where the political philosophy of the Father (or political Platonism) and the political philosophy of the Son (political Aristotelianism) acquire enormous importance. We went through the epoch of modernity over the course of which the Father was killed and the Son was castrated. The victory of modernity and the transition to post-modernity has been described in myth has the double gesture of the Great Mother, a point which has been deliberated in the traditions of different peoples. Mother Earth kills her Father/Husband, i.e., the figure who is the fundamental axis of the vertical topology of the political philosophy of Platonism, and she castrates her Beloved Son, i.e., denies the Aristotelian model its “unmoved mover” of the spiritual (eidetic) component.

This is materialism. In order to attain the domination of living matter from the bottom up, it is necessary to uproot two possible alternatives – the political philosophies of the Father and the Son. Both are incompatible with the political philosophy of the Mother.

Modernity is none other than the political philosophy of the Mother, materialism, living matter, or ὕλη.

Accordingly, all the foundational ideological and political-philosophical processes of the modern era are realized in the framework of this political philosophy of the Mother. According to the results of the political-ideological history of the modern era, liberalism turned out to be closest of all to the matriarchal view of the world, and political post-modernity even more sharply generates liberalism’s initially feminoid structure, since it is through it that the very matrix of modernity as the political philosophy of the Mother most fully and clearly exudes.

Stone or bird?

4PT presents itself as an appeal not to variations or combinations of the political philosophy of modernity, but to radical paradigm change. This change can be described negatively as a rejection of the political philosophy of the Mother in its metaphysical basis, i.e., simply as the liquidation of modernity altogether. The beginning of modernity already bears the meaning, content, and logic of its end.

Such a beginning of the modern era could not have led to anything other than contemporary liberal hegemony. In order to really part ways with this path today, we need to move in the opposite direction. But this does not mean that all that is necessary is to simply “not move” in the direction of modernization. After all, we are talking about setting a radically different goal – moving in a different direction, not forward, but backwards. The sky is behind us. We are descending from the political philosophy of the Father through the political philosophy of the Son to the political philosophy of the Earth.

Going right or left is a matter of choice when standing on a horizontal plane. But if we are a stone that is thrown, then we are falling, and our time is a time of fall, descent, Untergang. And if we are birds, then we have the chance to discover that falling from the nest is not the fall of a stone, but the fall of a chick who learns to fly through such a harsh experience.

It is at this point that a radical change in consciousness takes place. This is the beginning of 4PT. As long as the chick, thrown out of the nest, does not fly, then he does not know whether he is a stone or a bird. He who is used to falling is incapable of moving backwards along the only possible gravitational trajectory (movement in the direction of the abyss is not movement on a plane, but falling).

As follows, only “winged creatures” can accept 4PT. Here we can recall Plato’s teaching on what a human is. For this Greek philosopher, man is a winged creature who finds himself within his body as a result of the fall, due to a certain catastrophe. Man’s task is to cultivate his wings to learn to fly and so that death becomes a celebration of birth/resurrection just as death for a butterfly is the end of existence as a caterpillar. It is better still to “die while alive” and take off vertically – back towards our heavenly home. This is the point of 4PT.

4PT means striving to radically extend the logic of world history in the opposite direction. Insofar as this history is one of falling (moving from top to bottom, from the Logos of the Father to that of the Son and then to the Logos of the Mother), 4PT is a fundamental mission. It is not conservatism! In order to return “back”, we need to go up, where the machine of modernity cannot go.

Modernity is akin to a hearse descending down from a mountain. A hearse does not fly. In order to genuinely change the situation, it is necessary to principally reconsider our approach to all those things which are absolutely evident under the domination of the political philosophy of the Mother.

The devil as a metaphor, and not only...

There are no alternatives within the political philosophy of the Mother. Thus, the first political theory (liberalism) and its sub-ideological forms in the dissipative program of modernity are fate. This is not an accident, deviation, or dead end. It is fate. We have come here, and were called here. The greatest cunning of the devil is to get us to deny God. People think that there is no God, which means that there is not devil, to which the devil responds: "Right, there is no me." This is his second trick. But who, in this case, inspires all of this in us? The devil himself.

At the end of the process of secular modernity – tempered, consistent, and coherent satanism – the devil appears again, only this time without God.

At first modernity was the shadow of God, but then it became neither God nor his shadow. Then there was no God and only shadow. Correspondingly, the discovery of the devil, his incarnation, and his manifestation constitute the essence of the final phase of the political philosophy of modernity's transition to the political philosophy of post-modernity. The devil (the Antichrist) becomes apparent, reveals himself. From the point of view of political philosophy, we can examine this as a metaphor (the Antichrist as a political-philosophical figure). From the religious point of view, this may very well be interpreted literally.

Turning away from the fully revealed devil of post-modernity, 4PT proposes to take the flight/transition to those paradigms which were discarded, liquidated at the first stage of modernity.

In other words, we need not "slow down", but move in a different direction altogether. 4PT starts with man disagreeing with, denying, and rejecting the present program of evolution of political history, and makes a cold and in-depth semantic analysis of all the previous semantic points of political history.

Without this analysis, everything would remain on the level of emotions, reactive patterns, and appeals to the peripheral forms of modernity or its previous stages which have by and large been inscribed in the “global trend of conservatism.”

And here is the most interesting part: 4PT is counter-conservative. Conservatism, after all, is but the aspiration to move in the same direction at a reduced speed. 4PT proposes neither acceleration nor braking, for it does not think in these terms. 4PT insists that the whole path from the very beginning to the very end has led and is not leading there...

Refusing the Mother's hypnosis

A radical break with the hypnosis of the political philosophy of the Mother is the first fundamental gesture of 4PT. Further, we know that the political philosophies of the Father and Son exist. This is not a convention. In history, they boast a number of examples of effective realization. This is not an abstract dream or daydream. These political systems have existed throughout human history and partially retained their influence to this day in the contemporary world.

When we reject the political philosophy of the Mother, we do not fall into nothingness and chaos. We still have two very effective political-philosophical models. If we did not know the political philosophy of the Father and the political philosophy of the Son, then flowing along this “river” might not be so repulsive and, perhaps, we might agree to it given the absence of the very capacity to choose another direction – there is nothing out of the horror.

If not modernity, then nothing – thus the proponents of modernity and post-modernity want to tell us. But fortunately we know that there is the paradigm of the Father and the Son. This is the second, positive, and creative half of 4PT's program.

The most important point is that 4PT is based on the fact that the choice of paradigm is not within the three political ideologies (the Logos of the Great Mother), but within the three Logoi of the political philosophies of the Father (Platonism), the Son (Aristotelianism), and the Mother (materialism). This is a free choice in which modernity is nothing more than one option, and far from all.

The political philosophies of the Father and the Son (or their alliance) are objects of free choice. This is a task, not a given. It appears that we ended up in modernity because we forgot that the political philosophy of the Father and the political philosophy of the Son need to be constantly affirmed anew with each new generation and new person. We took them for something guaranteed, something taken for granted.

As soon as even a vertically-oriented political system becomes inertia or something ready-made and given, then it begins to fall, to collapse. If instead of as a free establishment we take the monarchical, imperial, traditional, and caste vertical to be a fact, something given, and once we no longer re-affirm such at each stage, then sooner or later we will fall into the dustbin of modernity and its last logical accord – the political philosophy of the Mother.

The black double

Thus, the essence of the political-philosophical dignity of man as a species is opened in 4PT – the dignity of the humanity that is now moving, whether faster or slower, in the direction of modernization, Westernization, and progress as if nothing is happening. This is the black double of mankind – the humanity which, by choosing freedom, chooses non-freedom, and while having the right to dignity, flight, and heroism, throws itself into slavery, misery, and in the service of matter.

Returning to the political philosophy of the Father or the Son is more difficult today than ever. But it is now that this choice carries all the fullness of its primordial, patriarchal, heroic meaning. Man differs from his black double in that he is a philosophical being capable of free choice. He has been given the freedom to choose his own political philosophy on a paradigmatic level (not on the basis of what the “menu” offers).

We can say that 4PT is an invitation to restore/reconstruct the political philosophy of the Father and the political philosophy of the Son. We know that these alternatives exist and we can freely choose them, thus destroying the hypnosis of the matrix of the three modern ideologies, the hypnosis of the matrix of the political philosophy of the Mother. We can choose an alternative political philosophy beyond what we are offered as exhaustive and complete. If such is really anything complete, then it is but the complete assortment of the devil’s temptations.

© Jafe Arnold – All Rights Reserved. No reproduction without expressed permission.

The Geographical and Geopolitical Foundations of Eurasianism

October 10, 2016

Author: Petr Savitsky

Translators: Jafe Arnold and John Stachelski

Article authored in Prague, Czechoslovakia in late 1933 – early 1934, first published in the German theological journal *Orient und Occident* No. 17 (Leipzig: 1934). Republished in and translated from the collection *Osnovy evraziistva* [Foundations of Eurasianism] (Moscow: Arktogeia, 2002).

Featured in *Foundations of Eurasianism – Volume I*

There are significantly more grounds for calling Russia the “middle state” (Zhongguo in Chinese) rather than China. The more time that passes, the more these grounds will make themselves evident. For Russia, Europe is nothing more than a peninsula of the Old Continent that lies to the West of its borders. On this continent, Russia itself occupies the main space, its torso. The total area of European states, taken together, is close to five million kilometers squared. The area of Russia within the borders of the contemporary USSR is significantly larger than 20 million kilometers squared (especially if one includes the space of the Mongolian and Tuva national republics of former “Outer Mongolia” and the “Uryankhay land” which at the current moment are parts of the Soviet Union).

With rare exception, the Russian people of the late 19th and early 20th centuries forgot about the spaces beyond the Urals (one of those who remembered them was the genius Russian chemist Dmitri Mendeleev). Now, another time has come. The whole “Ural-Kuznetsk combine,” with its blast furnaces, coal mines, and new cities with hundreds of thousands of inhabitants each, is being built behind the Urals. The Turkestan-Siberian Railway (“Turksib”) is being laid. Nowhere else is the expansion of Russian culture so wide and spontaneous as in another region beyond the Urals, in the so-called “Central Asian republics” (Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan). The whole torso of Russian lands, the “shot from Negoreloe to Suchan station”, is coming to life.

The Eurasianists have their share of merit in this turn of events. At the same time, the nature of the Russian world is being lucidly revealed as the central world of the Old Continent. There were moments when it seemed that between the periphery of Western Europe to which the Russian lands up to the Urals belong (the "European Russia" of the old geographers) and Asia (China, India, Iran), there lay only a void. The Eurasianist arrangement of the Russian present is filling this void with the pulse of animate life. Since the end of the 19th century, a direct path from Europe to China and Japan has been laid through Russia – the Great Siberian Railway. Geography points out with absolute certainty that there is no other way to run roads from Europe (at least from its northern part) to Persia, India, and Indochina. Even today, such opportunities have not yet been fully realized. The Trans-Persian railway, cutting through Persia from the direction of the Northwest toward the Southeast and connected with the same route network as British India and Europe (through the Caucasus, Crimea, and Ukraine), was close to fruition on the eve of the world war. Currently, however, it has receded into the realm of unestablished projects due to political circumstances. There is no connection between the railways of Russian Turkestan (the "Central Asian republics") and India, and Russian railway networks are not oriented toward Europe-India transit. But sooner or later, this movement will become a fact, whether in the form of railway paths, automobile lines, or air traffic. For the latter, the shortest distances are, let us say, of especially large importance for Russia. The greater the weight that will be procured by air traffic with its propensity and desire to fly in straight lines, the clearer the role of Russia-Eurasia as the "middle world" will become. The establishment of transpolar lines can still further enhance this role. In the Far North, Russia is a neighbor of America over a vast expanse. With the opening of a route through the pole, or rather over the pole, Russia will become the connecting link between Asia and North America.

Successive articles will discuss the Eurasianists' aspiration to offer a spiritual synthesis of Eastern and Western elements. Here, however, it is important to point out the correspondences of this aspiration which are found in the field of geopolitics. Russia-Eurasia is the center of the Old World. If one eliminates this center, then all of the other parts of the Old World, this whole system of continental margins (Europe, Western Asia, Iran, India, Indochina, China, and Japan) becomes but a mere "scattered temple." This world which lies to the East of Europe's borders and to the North of "classical" Asia is the link that binds together the unity of all of these pieces. This is obvious in the present, and it will only become clearer in the future.

The linking and unifying role of this "middle world" has made itself felt throughout history. For several millennia, political dominance in the Eurasian world belonged to nomads. Occupying the space stretching from Europe to China, while simultaneously reaching toward Western Asia, Iran, and India, the nomads served as intermediaries between the disparate worlds of settled cultures in their original states. Let us recall that historical interaction between Iran and China was never so close as in the era of Mongol rule (from the 13th to 14th centuries). And thirteen to fourteen centuries earlier, only through the nomadic Eurasian world did the paths of the Hellenic and Chinese cultures cross, as is shown by the latest excavations in Mongolia. It is an irremovable fact that the Russian world has been called to play a

unifying role within the confines of the Old World. Only to the extent that Russia-Eurasia fulfills this vocation can it turn into an organic whole combining all of the diverse cultures of the Old Continent and remove the confrontation between East and West. This fact is not yet sufficiently recognized in our time, but the correlations expressed by it lie in the very nature of things. The tasks of unification first and foremost boil down to tasks of cultural creativity. A new and independent historical force, Russian culture, has emerged at the center of the Old World to fulfill a unifying and conciliatory role. Russian culture can fulfill this task only by cooperating with the cultures of all the surrounding peoples. In this regard, the cultures of the East are just as important for Russia-Eurasia as the cultures of the West. The particularity of Russian culture and geopolitics lies precisely in such a simultaneous and even-footed approach to both East and West. For Russia, there are two equal fronts – Western and South-Eastern. The Russian field of view can and should become one which first and foremost covers the entire Old World to an equal and full extent.

Let us return, however, to phenomena of a purely geographical nature. In comparison to the Russian “torso,” Europe and Asia both represent the outskirts of the Old World. Moreover, from a Russian-Eurasian point of view, Europe is, as has been said, everything that lies to the West of the Russian border, while Asia is everything that lies to the South and Southeast of it. Russia itself is neither Asia nor Europe. Such is the fundamental geopolitical thesis of the Eurasianists. In this view, there is no “European” or “Asiatic” Russia, but merely parts of Russia which lie to the West or East of the Urals, just as there are parts of it lying to the West and East of the Yenisei River, and so on. The Eurasianists continue: Russia is neither Asia nor Europe, but instead represents its own special geographical world. How does this world differ from Europe and Asia? The Western, Southern, and South-Eastern outskirts of the continent differ to a significant extent in their coasts and topographical diversity. This cannot be said of the main “torso” which constitutes Russia-Eurasia. This torso consists first and foremost of three plains (the White Sea Plain, the West Siberian Plain, and the Turkestan Plain), and the regions lying to the east of them (including the low, mountainous countries to the east of the Yenisei river). The zonal composition of the Western and Southern outskirts of the continent are marked by “mosaic-fractional” and far from simple contours. Forested areas, in their natural state, are replaced here in a bizarre sequence by, on the one hand, steppe and desert regions, and on the other side by tundra areas in (the high mountains). This “mosaic” is contrasted on the central plains of the Old World by relatively simple, “flagged” distribution of zones. With the latter designation we point to the fact that, when applied to a map, this distribution resembles the contours of the horizontal stripes of a flag. Going from South to North, deserts, steppes, forests, and tundra follow each other successively. Each of these zones forms a continuous latitudinal band. The broad latitudinal division of the Russian world is further emphasized by the latitudinal stretch of mountain ranges framing the plains from the South: the Crimean ridge, the Caucasus, the Kopet Dag, the Parapamiz, the Hindu Kush, the main mountain ranges of the Tien Shan, the ranges in the North of Tibet, and the Ying Shan in the area of the Great Wall of China. The latter of these ranges lies on the same line bordering the southern, elevated plain occupied by the Gobi desert. This is linked to the Turkestan plain via the Dzhungarian gates.

In the zonal structure of the Old World's mainland, one can also note features of a peculiar East-West symmetry which render the character of phenomena in its eastern outskirts analogous to those in its western edges and which differ from the character of phenomena in the middle part of the continent. Both the eastern and western margins of the continent (the Far East and Europe) are located at latitudes between 35 and 60 degrees North which are naturally covered by forested regions. Here the boreal forests directly touch and gradually transition into the forests of southern flora. Nothing of the sort can be observed in the middle world, where forests of southern flora exist only in the regions of its mountainous peripheries (Crimea, the Caucasus, and Turkestan) and never meet forests of northern flora or boreal ones, being separated from such by a continuum of steppe-desert strips. The middle world of the Old World can thus be identified as the region of the steppe and desert band stretching in a continuous line from the Carpathians to the Khingan taken together with its mountain frame (in the South) and those regions lying to the North of it (forest and tundra zones). It is this world that the Eurasianists call Eurasia in the exact sense of this word (*Eurasia sensu stricto*). This must be distinguished from the old "Eurasia" of Alexander von Humboldt which encompassed the whole of the Old Continent (*Eurasia sensu latiore*).

The Western border of Eurasia runs along the Black Sea-Baltic bridge, i.e. the region where the continent narrows between the Baltic and Black Seas. Along this bridge and in general in the direction from Northwest to Southeast run a number of indicative botanical-geographical borders such as, for example, the Eastern borders of yew, beech, and ivy. Starting on the shores of the Baltic Sea, each of these tree types then extends all the way to the Black Sea. West of these borders, i.e. where the aforementioned species still grow, the stretch of the forest zone is continuous along the entire length from North to South. To the East begins the division into the forest zone in the North and the steppe zone in the South. This boundary can be considered the Western border of Eurasia. Eurasia's border with Asia in the Far East runs along the longitudes at which the continuous strip of steppes dips in its nearing the Pacific Ocean, i.e., at the longitude of the Khingan.

The Eurasian world is a world of "both periodic and symmetric zone systems." The boundaries of the main Eurasian zones conform with significant accuracy to the spanning of certain climatic boundaries. For example, the Southern border of the tundra matches the line joining the point of average annual relative humidity of 79.5% at 1 P.M. (The relative humidity in the afternoon is of particularly great importance for the life of vegetation and soils). The Southern border of the forest zone lies along the line connecting points with the same relative humidity of 67.5%. The Southern border of the steppe (with its tip into the desert) is matched by the uniform relative humidity at 1 P.M. of 55.5%. In the desert, it is always lower than this value. Attention should be drawn here to the equality of intervals covering the forest and steppe zones. These coincidences and this rhythmic distribution of intervals can be established in accordance with different indices (see our book *The Geographical Particularities of Russia – Part 1*, Prague: 1927). This gives grounds to speak of a "periodic table of the zone systems of Russia-Eurasia." Russia-Eurasia is a symmetric system, not in the sense of the East-West symmetry which

we discussed in the preceding, but in a South-North symmetry. The treeless tundra of the North is matched by the treeless steppes of the South. Moreover, the calcium content and percentage of humus in soil from the middle parts of the black soil zone symmetrically decrease when moving in the directions of North and South. This symmetric distribution of phenomena can also be noted in terms of soil colors, which reaches its greatest intensity in the very same middle portions of the horizontal zone. Moving both Northward and Southward, the soil color weakens (passing through shades of brown to whitish ones). In terms of sand and rock substrates, there is also a symmetrical divergence from the border between the forest and steppe zones: between the steppe islands to the North and the "islands" of forests in the South. Russian science defines this phenomenon as "extrazonal." The steppe sectors in the forest zone can be characterized as a "southward-bearing" phenomenon, while the forest islands in the steppes are essentially a "northward-bearing" phenomenon. The southward-bearing formations of the forest zone match the northward-bearing formations of the steppes.

Nowhere else in the Old World is such a gradual transition in zonal systems, with both its "frequency" and simultaneous "symmetry", displayed so clearly as on the plains of Russia-Eurasia.

The Russian world thus possesses an exceedingly clear geographic structure. The Urals do not play the defining and divisive role in this structure which they have been attributed (and still are) by geographical "clichés." By virtue of their orographic and geological specificities, the Urals not only do not divide but, on the contrary, rather closely tie together "pre-Ural" and "post-Ural" Russia, thereby once again demonstrating that, taken together, both geographically constitute the "single undivided continent of Eurasia." The tundra, as a horizontal zone, lies both to the West and to the East of the Urals just as forest extends beyond one side and the other. The same is the case regarding the steppes and desert (the latter borders the southern continuation of the Ural-Mugodzhary from both the East and West). We can observe no significant changes in geographical environment signified by the "border" of the Urals. More substantial is the geographical border of the "Intermarium", i.e. the space between the Black and Baltic Seas on the one hand, and the Baltic Sea and the coast of Northern Norway on the other.

This distinctive, lucid, and at the same time simple geographical structure of Russia-Eurasia is tied to a number of important geopolitical circumstances. The nature of the Eurasian world is minimally favorable to any sort of "separatisms," be they political, cultural, or economic. The specific "mosaic-fractional" structure of Europe and Asia facilitates the appearance of small, confined, and isolated worlds offering the material preconditions for the existence of small states, cultural modes specific to a city or province, and economic regions possessing large economic diversity within a narrow space. But Eurasia is quite another case. The wide-cut sphere of "flag-like" zonal distribution is not conducive to anything of this sort. Endless plains habituate horizontal breadth and the spread of geopolitical combinations. Within the steppes, moving across land along the forests and numerous bodies of water, such as rivers and lakes, man found himself in constant migration, continuously changing his place of inhabitance. Ethnic

and cultural elements are drawn into intensive interaction, cross-fertilizing, and mixing. In Europe and Asia, it sometimes happened that one could live only by the interests of his own "belfry."

But in Eurasia, if this happened at all, then in an historical sense this lasted only an extremely brief period of time. In Northern Eurasia there are hundreds of thousands of kilometers of forests among which there is not a single hectare of arable land. How can the inhabitants of this space survive without contact with the more Southern regions? In the South, on no less vastly spread steppes suitable for livestock and partly for agriculture, there is not a single tree across many thousands of kilometers. How can the population of these regions live without economic interaction with the North? The nature of Eurasia prompts people to the necessity of political, cultural, and economic association to a significantly greater extent than is observed in Europe and Asia. It is thus no wonder that what was in many respects a "unified" way of life, such as that of the nomads, existed across the whole space of the Eurasian steppes from Hungary to Manchuria, and throughout history from the Scythians to the modern Mongols. It is similarly no wonder that such great attempts at political unification were born on the expanses of Eurasia, such as those of the Scythians, Huns, and Mongols (in the 13th-14th centuries), and others. These attempts included not only the steppes and desert, but also the northern forest zone and the southernmost "mountain hem" of Eurasia. It is no coincidence that the spirit of a sort of "brotherhood of peoples" is blowing over Eurasia, having its roots in the centuries-old contact and cultural mergers of peoples of the most diverse races, ranging from Germanic peoples (the Crimean Goths) and Slavs to the Tungus-Manchurians with links via the Finnish, Turkic, and Mongolian peoples. This "brotherhood of peoples" is reflected in the fact that there is no opposition between "higher" and "lower" races, but rather a mutual attraction, much stronger than any repulsion, which easily awakens a "will for a common cause." The history of Eurasia from its first chapters to its latest is solid proof of this. These traditions were embraced by Russia in her foundational, historic cause. In the 19th and 20th centuries, they were at times clouded by deliberate "Westernism", which demanded that Russians feel themselves to be "Europeans" (which they in fact weren't) and treat the other Eurasian peoples as "Asians" or an "inferior race." Such an interpretation led Russia to nothing other than disaster (such as Russia's Far Eastern adventure at the beginning of the 20th century). It should be hoped that this concept has been completely overcome by now in the Russian consciousness and that the remnants of Russian "Europeanism" still hiding in emigration are void of any historical significance. Only by overcoming deliberate "Westernism" can the path be opened to real brotherhood between the Eurasian peoples – the Slavic, the Finnic, the Turkic, Mongolian, and others.

Eurasia has previously played a unifying role in the Old World. Contemporary Russia, absorbing this tradition, must resolutely and irrevocably abandon the old methods of unification belonging to an outlived and overcome era, such as those of violence and war. In the modern period, the cause is one of cultural creativity, inspiration, insight, and cooperation. This is what the Eurasianists say. Despite all the modern means of communication, the peoples of Europe and Asia are still, to a large extent, sitting in their own quarters, living by the interests of their own belfries. Eurasian "place-development" propels

this common cause by virtue of its fundamental qualities. The Eurasian peoples have been appointed to draw other peoples of the world along these paths by example. And then the relations of ethnographic kinship by which a number of Eurasian peoples are connected with various non-Eurasian nations, such as the Indo-European ties of the Russians, the Near-Asian and Iranian relations of the Eurasian Turks, and those points of contact that exist between the Eurasian Mongols and the peoples of East Asia, will become useful for the ecumenical cause. All of these relations can be beneficial to the construction of a new, organic culture for the "Old" World, which is (we believe) still young, carrying in its womb a grand future.

The Geopolitics of the European "New Right"

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

1. Alain de Benoist's Europe of a Hundred Flags

One of the few European geopolitical schools which has preserved an uninterrupted link with the ideas of the pre-war German continentalist geopoliticians is that of the "New Right." This trend appeared in France in the late '60's and is associated with the philosopher and publicist Alain de Benoist, the leading figure of the movement.

The "New Right" sharply differs on practically all matters from the traditional French right consisting of monarchists, Catholics, Germanophobes, chauvinists, anti-communists, conservatives, etc. The "New Right" includes those who support "organic democracy," pagans, Germanophiles, socialists, modernists, etc. At the beginning, the "left camp" so conventionally, extremely influential in France considered such to be a "tactical maneuver" by typical rightists, but with time the gravity of this evolution was proven and came to be recognized by all.

One of the fundamental principles of the "New Right's" ideology, analogues of which soon appeared in other European countries, is the principal of "continental geopolitics." In contrast to the "old right" and classical nationalists, de Benoist believed that the principle of the centralized Nation-State has been historically exhausted and that the future belongs only to "Great Spaces." The basis of such "Large Spaces" are to be not so much associations of various states in a pragmatic political bloc, but the equal-footed conglomeration of ethnic groups of different scales into a "Federal Empire." Such a "Federal Empire" is supposed to be strategically unified, yet ethnically differentiated. Moreover, such strategic unity is to be underpinned by the unity of primordial culture.

The "Large Space" which interested de Benoist most of all was Europe. The New Right believed that the peoples of Europe possess a common Indo-European heritage, a single origin, and the principle of a "common past." The conditions of the modern epoch, in which tendencies of strategic and economic integration are actively essential for the possession of any real geopolitical sovereignty, dictate the necessity of uniting in even a purely pragmatic sense. Thus, the peoples of Europe are destined for a

“common future,” and therein de Benoist draws the conclusion that the thesis of a “United Europe of a hundred flags” [16] must become Europeans’ fundamental geopolitical standard. In such a perspective, as in all the concepts of the New Right, a striving to combine “conservative” and “modernist” elements, i.e., “right” and “left” principles, is clearly visible. In recent years, the New Right has rejected such a label insofar as it considers itself to be “right” to the same extent that it is “left.”

De Benoist’s geopolitical theses are based on an affirmation of the “continental fate of Europe.” In this regard, he fully adheres to the conceptions of Haushofer’s school. From this follows the New Right’s characteristic juxtaposition of “Europe” and the “West.” For them, Europe is a continental, geopolitical formation founded on an ensemble of ethnicities with a common Indo-European origin and possessing common cultural roots. This concept is a traditional one. The “West,” on the contrary, is a geopolitical and historical concept of the modern world which denies ethnic and spiritual traditions, instead putting forth purely material and quantitative criteria of existence, i.e., an essentially utilitarian and rationalist, mechanistic bourgeois civilization. Accordingly, the USA is understood as the most complete incarnation of the West and its “civilization.”

The concrete project of the New Right unfolds along this plane. Europe is to integrate into a “Federal Empire” in opposition to the West and the US. Moreover, regionalist tendencies are to be particularly encouraged, as regions and ethnic minorities retain more traditional features than the metropolises and cultural centers affected by the “Spirit of the West.” On this note, France is supposed to orient itself towards Germany and Middle Europa – hence the interest of the New Right in De Gaulle and Friedrich Naumann. On the level of practical politics, since the ’70’s the New Right has acted in favor of Europe’s strict strategic neutrality, its withdrawal from NATO, and the development of independent, European nuclear potential.

In regards to the USSR (and later Russia), the position of the New Right has evolved. Starting with the classical thesis of “Neither West nor East, but Europe”, the New Right has since gradually developed the thesis of “Europe above all, but better with the East than with the West.” On a practical level, the original interest in China and the project of a strategic alliance between Europe and China for the purpose of opposing both “American and Soviet imperialism” came to be replaced with a moderate “Sovietophilia” and ideas of a European-Russian alliance.

The New Right’s geopolitics are radically anti-Atlanticist and anti-Mondialist in orientation. They see the fate of Europe as the antithesis of the Atlanticist and Mondialist projects and are thus opponents of “thalassocracy” and the “One World” concept.

It should be noted that in the conditions of the total strategic and political domination of Atlanticism in Europe during the Cold War, de Benoist's geopolitical position (theoretically and logically flawless), being contrasted to the "norms of political thought," had no chance of becoming widespread. It was in its own way a kind of "dissidence", and like any "dissidence" or "non-conformism," it had a marginal character. To this day, the intellectual level of the New Right, the high quality of its publications, and even the number of its followers among European academia have been ignored by authorities and the analytical institutions which delegate authority to geopolitical projects.

2. Jean Thiriart – Europe from Vladivostok to Dublin

Yet another excellent variety of continentalist geopolitics was developed by another European "dissident," the Belgian Jean Thiriart (1922-1992). From the early '60's onwards, he was the leader of the pan-European radical movement "Young Europe."

Thiriart considered geopolitics to be the foremost discipline of political science without which it is impossible to construct a rational and farsighted political or state strategy. As a follower of Haushofer and Niekisch, he considered himself to be a "European National Bolshevik" and a builder of the "European Empire." It was his ideas which anticipated the further developed and more sophisticated projects of the New Right.

Jean Thiriart built his political theory on the principle of the "autarchy of large spaces." Developed in the middle of the 19th century by the German economist Friedrich List, this theory asserts that the potential strategic and economic development of a state is possible only if it possesses sufficient geopolitical scale and larger territorial advantages. Thiriart applied this concept to the actual situation in Europe and came to the conclusion that the global value of Europe's states would ultimately be lost if they did not unite into a unified Empire in opposition to the USA. Moreover, Thiriart believed that such an "Empire" would not be "federal" and "regional-oriented", but ultimately unitary, centralized, and would become a powerful, single continental Nation-State in accordance with the Jacobin model. Here lies the fundamental difference between the views of de Benoist and Thiriart.

In the late '70's Thiriart's views underwent some modification. An analysis of the prevailing geopolitical situation led him to the conclusion that Europe's scale was insufficient to liberate it from American thalassocracy. Consequently, the main condition for "European liberation" was the unification of Europe and the USSR. He moved from a geopolitical scheme involving three main zones – the West, Europe, and Russia (USSR) – to one with only two components, i.e., the West and the Eurasian continent. Moreover,

Thiriart came to the radical conclusion that Europe would have to choose Soviet socialism over Anglo-Saxon capitalism.

Thus appeared the project of the “Euro-Soviet Empire from Vladivostok to Dublin” [17]. This proposition nearly prophetically described the reasons which would lead to the collapse of the USSR if it did not commit to new geopolitical moves in Europe and the South in the near future. Thiriart believed that the ideas of Haushofer concerning a “continental bloc of Berlin-Moscow-Tokyo” were relevant to a large extent even now. It is important that these theses of Thiriart were presented 15 years before the collapse of the USSR and absolutely accurately predicted the logic and reasons behind this disaster. Thiriart unsuccessfully attempted to present his views to Soviet leaders, but he did personally meet with Nasser, Zhou Enlai, and senior Yugoslav officials in the '60's. It is significant that Moscow rejected his proposed organization of clandestine “European liberation brigades” tasked with waging a terroristic struggle against “Atlanticist agents” in Europe.

Jean Thiriart's views currently underpin the active, non-conformist movement of the European National-Bolsheviks, such as the European Liberation Front, and are thoroughly in line with the projects of contemporary Russian Neo-Eurasianism.

3. Thinking in Continents – Jordis von Lohausen

Thiriart himself was very close to the Austrian general Jordis von Lohausen who, unlike Thiriart and de Benoist, did not participate in direct political activism or build concrete social projects. Instead, Lohausen adhered to a strictly scientific approach and restricted himself to pure geopolitical analysis, although his original position as a continentalist and follower of Haushofer was one and the same with that of the National-Bolsheviks and New Right.

Lohausen believed that political power can only become durable and sustainable when rulers think in terms of “millennia and continents” rather than in immediate or local categories. His main work, accordingly, is titled *The Strength to Conquer – Thinking in Continents* [18].

Lohausen was of the opinion that global territorial, civilizational, and cultural as well as social process are only understandable if they are examined from a “farsighted” perspective as opposed to what he termed historical “short-sightedness.” In human society, authority, upon which the choice of historical path and the most important decisions depend, should be guided by the most general schemes which

allow this or that state or people to find their place in a vast historical perspective. Therefore, the basic discipline necessary for the determination of power strategies is geopolitics in its traditional sense of operating with global categories while remaining aloof of analytical particularities (like Lacoste's "internal" school of applied geopolitics). Modern ideologies and the latest technological and civilizational shifts undoubtedly change the topography of the world, but they cannot cancel the basic laws linked to natural and cultural cycles that are measured in millennia.

Such global categories include space, language, ethnos, and resources, etc. Lohausen thus proposes the following formula of power: "strength = force x location."

Lohausen elaborates:

"Insofar as Strength is Power multiplied by location, only a favorable geographical position offers the opportunity of fully developing internal forces." [19]

Thus, power (political, intellectual, etc.) is directly linked with space.

Lohausen separated the fate of Europe from the fate of the West as he considered Europe to be a continental formation only temporarily under the control of thalassocracy. Accordingly, the geopolitical liberation of Europe requires a spatial (positional) minimum which can be achieved only through the unification of Germany, integration processes in Central Europe, the restoration of Prussia's territorial integrity (torn between Poland, the USSR, and the GDR), and the further gathering of European states into a new, autonomous bloc independent of Atlanticism. In this scheme, it is important to note the role of Prussia which Lohausen (following Niekisch and Spengler) considered to be the most continental, "Eurasian" part of Germany. If Königsberg was the capital of Germany instead of Berlin, then European history would have gone in a different, more "correct" direction with an emphasis on a European-Russian alliance against Anglo-Saxon thalassocracy.

Lohausen considered the future of Europe to be unthinkable from a strategic perspective without Russia and, vice versa, Russia (the USSR) needed Europe. Without it, Russia would be geopolitically "incomplete" and vulnerable to America, whose location is so much more advantageous that, consequently, its strength could sooner or later outstrip the USSR. Lohausen stressed that the USSR could have four different Europes to its West – a "hostile Europe," a "subordinated Europe," a "devastated Europe," or a "European ally." The first three variants would be inevitable if the USSR

continued its European policy which, indeed, ultimately brought the Soviet Union to defeat in the Cold War. Only striving to make Europe "allied and friendly" at any cost could have redeemed the fatal geopolitical situation of the USSR and signaled a new stage in geopolitical history – a Eurasian stage.

Lohausen purposefully confined his position to pure geopolitical observations, and he ignored any ideological issues. For example, to him the Boyar Rus, Tsarist Russia, and the Soviet Union were all parts of a single continuous process independent of changes in the ruling system or ideology. Geopolitically, Russia was heartland and its fate was predetermined by its lands no matter what regime ruled it.

Like Thiriart, Lohausen foresaw the geopolitical collapse of the USSR as an inevitability if it continued to follow its usual course. However, what Atlanticist geopoliticians considered to be a victory, Lohausen saw above all as a defeat for continental forces. With this, however, there was a nuance. The collapse of the Soviet system could open new opportunities for creating a positive point of reference for the establishment of a future Eurasian bloc, a continental Empire, insofar as certain restrictions such as the ones imposed by Marxist ideology would be removed.

4. Jean Parvulesco's Eurasian Empire of the End

A more romantic version of geopolitics was put forth by the famous French writer Jean Parvulesco. Earlier geopolitical themes in literature had arisen in George Orwell's dystopian 1984 which futuristically described the division of the world into three enormous continental blocs: Eastasia, Eurasia, and Oceania. Similar themes can be encountered in the works of Arthur Kestler, Aldous Huxley, Raymond Abellio, etc.

Jean Parvulesco made geopolitical themes central in all of his publications, thereby opening a new genre of "geopolitical fiction."

Parvulesco's concepts can be summarized briefly by the following [20]: the history of mankind is the history of Power and authority. Various semi-secret organizations strive to access central positions in civilization, i.e., Power, the cycles of existence of which far exceed the duration of conventional political ideologies, ruling dynasties, religious institutions, or states and nations. The two organizations that have acted throughout history, albeit under different names, are distinguished by Parvulesco as the "Order of Atlanticists" and the "Order of Eurasianists." Between these two forces rages a centuries-old struggle participated in by such disparate figures as the Pope, patriarchs, kings, diplomats, financiers,

revolutionaries, mystics, generals, scientists, artists, etc. All socio-cultural manifestations, accordingly, boil down to primordial, albeit extremely complex, geopolitical archetypes.

This is a geopolitical line pushed to the logical limit, the roots of which were even clearly traced by the rather rationalistic founders of geopolitics as such who were “foreign” to such “mysticism.”

In Parvulesco’s plots, General De Gaulle and the geopolitics structures founded by him, which remained in the shadows after his presidency, play a central role. Parvulesco terms this “geopolitical holism.” Such “geopolitical holism” is the French analogue of the Haushofer school’s continentalism.

The main task of the supporters of this line was the organization of the European continental bloc “Paris-Berlin-Moscow” and in this aspect Parvulesco’s theories interlock with the theses of the New Right and the National-Bolsheviks.

Parvulesco maintained that the current historical stage is one of the culmination of centuries of geopolitical confrontation in which the dramatic history of the continental-civilizational duel will come to a head. He predicted the imminent emergence of the giant continental-scale construction of the “Eurasian Empire of the End” and the final showdown with the “Empire of the Atlantic.” He described this eschatological encounter in an apocalyptic tone as the “Endkampf” (“Final Battle”). Interestingly enough, the fictional characters of Parvulesco’s texts act side by side with real historical personalities, many of which the author maintained (and to this day still does) friendly relationships with. Among them are politicians from De Gaulle’s inner circle, English and American diplomats, the poet Ezra Pound, the philosopher Julius Evola, the politician and writer Raymond Abellio, the sculptor Arno Breker, various members of occult organizations, etc.

Despite the fictional character of Parvulesco’s texts, they in fact possess relatively enormous geopolitical value, as a number of his articles published in the late ’70’s strangely enough accurately described the situation which prevailed in the world in the mid ’90s.

5. The Indian ocean as a path to world domination – Robert Steuckers

The total opposite of the “geopolitical visionary” that was Parvulesco is the Belgian geopolitician and publicist Robert Steuckers, the publisher of the two prestigious journals *Orientations* and *Vouloir*.

Steuckers approached geopolitics from a purely scientific, rationalist position and strove to liberate the discipline from what he deemed all of its “random” eccentricities. Following the logic of the New Right in an academic orientation, he nonetheless came to conclusions strikingly close to the “prophecies” of Parvulesco.

Steuckers also believed that the socio-political and diplomatic projects of different states and blocs, no matter in whatever ideological form they are clothed in, represent veiled and temporarily indirect expressions of global geopolitical projects. In this phenomenon he saw the influence of the “Land” factor on human history, as man is a creature of the earth (created from earth). As follows, earth and space predetermine man in the most significant of his manifestations. This theory was the precursor of “geohistory.”

For Steuckers, a continentalist orientation was a priority as he considered Atlanticism to be hostile to Europe and believed the fate of European prosperity to be connected with Germany and [21]. Steuckers was an active proponent of Europe’s cooperation with Third World countries and the Arab world in particular.

Along with this, he stressed the enormous importance of the Indian Ocean to the future geopolitical structure of the planet. He defined the Indian Ocean as the “Middle Ocean” located between the Atlantic and Pacific, strictly in the middle between the eastern coast of Africa and the Pacific zone home to New Zealand, Australia, New Guinea, Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Indochina. Maritime control over the Indian Ocean was considered to be a key position for geopolitically influencing three of the most important “large spaces,” i.e., Africa, southern-Eurasian Rimland, and the Pacific region. Hence the strategic priority attached to various small islands in the Indian Ocean, especially Diego Garcia which is equidistant from all coastal areas.

Steuckers asserted that the Indian Ocean was the territory on which all of European strategy should be focused insofar as it is through this zone that Europe could influence the USA, Eurasia, and Japan all at once. From his point of view, the decisive geopolitical confrontation which would determine the future 21st century would unfold in precisely this space.

Steuckers actively busied himself with the history of geopolitics and is the author of the article on geopolitics in the new edition of the Brussels Encyclopedia.

6. Carlo Terracciano: Russia + Islam = the salvation of Europe

A particularly active center of continentally-oriented geopolitics can be found in Italy. After the Second World War, the ideas of Carl Schmitt were more widespread in Italy than in any other European country, and thanks to this the geopolitical mindset is very common there. In addition, it was precisely in Italy that Jean Thiriart's "Young Europe" movement and the ideas of continental National-Bolshevism were most developed of all.

Of all the numerous political and sociological journals and centers of the New Right dealing with geopolitics, the Milanese "Orion" magazine, in which the geopolitical analyses of Dr. Carlo Terracciano were published regularly over the course of 10 years, is of particular interest. Terracciano professed the most extreme version of European continentalism most immediately congruent to Eurasianism.

Terracciano fully accepted the map of Mackinder and Mahan and concurs with the rigorous civilizational and geopolitical dualism distinguished by them. Moreover, believing that the fate of Europe as a whole totally depends on the fate of Russia, Eurasia, and the East, he clearly stands on the side of heartland. For him, the continental East is a positive and the Atlanticist West is a negative. Radical approaches are exceptions among Europeans, even among continentally-oriented geopoliticians, and Terracciano does not put any accent on the special status of Europe, instead believing that it is a mere secondary point in view of the planetary confrontation of thalassocracy and tellurocracy. He fully subscribed to the idea of a united Eurasian State, a "Euro-Soviet Empire from Vladivostok to Dublin," which brings him close to Thiriart. However, he does not share the "Jacobinism" and "universalism" inherent to Thiriart, instead insisting on ethno-cultural differentiation and regionalism which, in turn, brings him close to Alain de Benoist.

Terracciano underlines the centrality of the Russian factor which he combines with another interesting point – he believes that the most important role in the fight with Atlanticism belongs to the Islamic world, especially the anti-American regimes of Iran, Libya, Iraq, etc. This leads him to the conclusion that the Islamic world is, to a large extent, a proponent of continental geopolitical interests. He even considered "fundamentalist" versions of Islam to be positive in this regard.

The ultimate formula which summarizes the geopolitical views of Dr. Terracciano is the following: Russia (heartland) + Islam vs. USA (Atlanticism, Mondialism) [22].

Terracciano saw Europe as the bridgehead of a Russo-Islamic anti-Mondialist bloc. In his opinion, only such a radical approach can objectively result in a genuine European renaissance.

Terracciano's views are shared by other associates of Orion and the intellectual center working at its base (including professor Claudio Mutti, Maurizio Murelli, the sociologist Alessandra Colla, Marko Battarra, etc.). A number of leftist, social-democratic, communist, and anarchist circles in Italy, the newspaper Umanità, and the journal Nuovo Angolazione have gravitated in this National-Bolshevik direction [represented by Terracciano].

Footnotes:

[16] Alain de Benoist "Les idess a l'endroit", Paris, 1979

[17] Jean Thiriart "L'Empire Eurosovietique de Vladivostok jusque Dublin", Brussell, 1988

[18] Jordis von Lohausen "Mut zur Macht. Denken in Kontinenten", Berg, 1978

[19] Ibid

[20] Jean Parvulesco "Galaxie GRU", Paris, 1991

[21] Robert Steukers "La Russie, L'Europe et L'Occident" dans "Orientation" № 4 nov.-dec. 1983

[22] Carlo Terracciano "Nel Fiume della Storia" in "Orion", Milano, №№ 22 — 30, 1986 — 1987

Translator: Jafe Arnold

<http://www.eurasianistarchive.com/author/alexander-dugin/the-geopolitics...>

The Gnostic

March 9, 2019

Author: Alexander Dugin

Source: Open Revolt

Originally published in 1995 in Limonka, the official newspaper of the National Bolshevik Party.

The time has come to reveal the truth, to expose the spiritual essence of what boot-licking ordinary people call “political extremism.” We have confused them enough by changing the labels of our political sympathies, the color of our heroes, and by passing from fire to cold, from “rightism” to “leftism” and back again. All of this has been but an intellectual artillery barrage, a kind of ideological warm-up.

We have frightened and tempted the extreme right and extreme left, and now both, and others, have lost their way, strayed from the beaten tracks. This is amazing. As the great Evgeniy Golovin liked to repeat: “He who goes against the day, should not fear the night.” There is nothing more pleasant than when the ground is slipping out from under your feet. This is the first experience of flight. It kills vermin. It tempers angels.

Who are we, really? Whose menacing face is it all the more clearly peering out from the paradoxical, radical political movement with the terrifying name “National Bolshevism?”

Today we can respond without any ambiguity and vagueness. But this necessitates a brief excursion into the history of the spirit.

Mankind has always had two types of spirituality, two paths – the “Right Hand Path” and the “Left Hand Path.” The first is characterized by a positive attitude towards the surrounding world, in which harmony, balance, bliss, and peace are seen. All evil is but a particular instance, a local deviation from the norm, something insignificant, transient, having no deep, transcendental causes. The Right Hand Path is also called the “Milky Way.” It does not subject man to any particular suffering; it protects him from radical experiences, leads him away from immersion in suffering, and away from the nightmare of being. This is a false path. It leads to slumber. It leads to nowhere.

The second path, the "Left Hand Path", sees everything in the reverse. There is no milky bliss, but black suffering; no silent calm, but the festering, fiery drama of split being. This is the "path of wine." It is destructive, terrifying. Wrath and rage reign on it. In this path, all reality is perceived as hell, as ontological exile, as torture, as submersion into the heart of some kind of unthinkable catastrophe originating from the very heights of the cosmos.

If on the first path everything appears to be good, then on the second path everything appears evil. This path is monstrously difficult, but it is the only true one. On this path it is easy to stumble and even easier to disappear. It guarantees nothing. It entices no one. But only this path is correct. He who takes this path will gain fame and immortality. He who survives it will prevail and receive an award that is higher than being.

He who goes down the Left Hand Path knows that it will end. The dungeon of matter will collapse and be transformed into a heavenly city. A chain of initiates passionately prepares the desired moment, the moment of the End, the triumph of total liberation.

These two paths are not two different religious traditions. Both are possible in all religions, in all confessions, in all churches. There are no external differences between them whatsoever. They concern the most intimate parts of man, his secret essence. They cannot be chosen. They themselves choose a man to be their victim, their servant, their instrument, their weapon.

The Left Hand Path is called "gnosis", "knowledge." It is just as bitter as knowledge and it generates sorrow and cold tragedy. Once upon a time in antiquity, when mankind still attached decisive importance to spiritual things, the Gnostics created their own theories on the level of a philosophy, a doctrine, the cosmological mysteries, and on a cult level. Gradually people degenerated, stopped paying attention to the sphere of thought, and plunged into physiology in search of individual comfort in everyday life.

But the Gnostics did not disappear. They moved the dispute to a level of things understandable to modern citizens.

Some of them proclaimed slogans of “social justice”, developed theories of class struggle, and communism. The Mystery of Sophia became “class consciousness”, and the “struggle against the evil Demiurge, the creator of the cursed world” took the shape of social battles. The threads of ancient knowledge stretched to Marx, Nechaev, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, and Che Guevara. The wine of socialist revolution, the joy of rebellion against the forces of fate, and the sacred, berserker passion for total destruction of all that was black for the sake of obtaining a new, otherworldly Light.

Others opposed the ordinariness of everydayness with the secret energy of race, the noise of blood. Against mixing and deformity they raised laws of purity and a new sacrality, a return to the Golden Age, the Great Return. Nietzsche, Heidegger, Evola, Hitler, and Mussolini draped the Gnostic will in national, racial teachings.

It is quite right that the communists didn’t care much for workers, nor Hitler for Germans, but not out of cynicism. Both were obsessed with a deeper, more ancient, more absolute aspiration, the common Gnostic spirit, the secret and terrible light of the Left Hand Path. What workers, what “Aryans”... The point is totally different.

Other creative personalities summoned to the Left Hand Path, the path of gnosis, also floundered between “reds” and “blacks” and “whites” and “browns” in their spiritual quests. Entangling themselves in political doctrines, going to extremes, and yet unable to clearly express the metaphysical contours of their obsession, artists from Shakespeare to Artaud and from Michelangelo to Eemans, from the troubadours to Breton, have drunk the secret wine of suffering, greedily soaking up in society, passions, sects and occult brotherhoods the disparate fragments of a terrible teaching that leaves smiling impossible. The Templars, Dante, Lautréamont. They never smiled in their lives. This is a sign of a special chosenness, a trace of a monstrous experience of something that has been common for all Left Hand Pathers.

The Gnostic looks at our world with his severe gaze – the same gaze as that of his predecessors, the links in the ancient chain of the elect of Horror. A repulsive picture reflects in his eyes. A mad West in consumer psychosis. An East whose dullness and pathetic submissiveness disgusts. A sunken world, a planet lying on the bottom.

“In underwater woods, rush is useless and motion ceases...” (Golovin)

But the Gnostic does not abandon his cause. Not now, not tomorrow, not ever. Moreover, he has every reason to celebrate on the inside. Did we not tell the naive optimists of the “Right Hand Path” where their excessive ontological trust will lead? Did we not predict the degeneration of their creative instinct down to the grotesque parody that is today’s conservatives, who have reconciled with everything that horrified their more sympathetic (but no less hypocritical) predecessors just a few millennia ago? They didn’t listen to us. Now let them blame themselves and read New Age booklets or marketing handbooks.

We have forgiven no one. We have forgotten nothing.

We have not been deceived by the changes in social decorations and political (wanna-be) actors.

We have a very long memory. We have very long hands.

We have a very severe tradition.

The labyrinths of being, the spirals of thoughts, the whirlpools of anger...

The Indo-Europeans

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Dugin's Guideline –

Greetings, you're watching Dugin's Guideline.

Let's talk about the Indo-Europeans. Why is this important? Because over the last few millennia, the Indo-European peoples in both the West – in Europe – and in the East – in Iran and India – have stood in the center of all of the most significant events and processes on a planetary scale. Far from all of these events have been graceful or wonderful, but the ups and downs of the last millennia are the work of none other than the Indo-Europeans. Today, as the fate of the Indo-European peoples and cultures is becoming all the more problematic with each passing day, and as a crisis of identity, demographic catastrophe, and overall some kind of obvious clouding of consciousness stare Indo-Europeans in the face, it is time to pose the question: who are the Indo-Europeans? What unites them, if anything unites them at all? What are they approaching in this critical moment of their history and fate?

This is also important because we, Slavs, are also part of Indo-European civilization. Our language, culture, and history are Indo-European. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of historians and linguists are convinced that the first Indo-European tribes – the ancestors of the peoples of Europe, India, Iran, and even the Malaysian Hittites – came from the lands that have been the territories of our country, Great Russia, for centuries.

The Indo-Europeans' identity rests in the following. These are none other than the peoples who since antiquity worshipped the heavenly, fatherly gods of light. In ancient times, polytheism predominated among the Indo-Europeans, but after the birth of Christ exactly 2017 years ago, more and more Indo-Europeans, starting with the Greeks and Romans, embraced Christianity. Not all of Europe became Christian, but in this case the God of the Trinity was conceived as the uncreated Light, the Heavenly King and, after all, loyalty to light and the sky was an integral feature of the Indo-European religion.

The Indo-European peoples are of the patriarchal family. They did not humiliate women, nor did they consider them to be objects or slaves, but they did not give them free will. Indo-European patriarchy originated from the principle that the sky is the father and the earth is the mother. This does not belittle earth or women, but the vertical is obvious.

The French historian Georges Dumézil substantiated and proved that all Indo-European societies were built on a triadic model founded on three castes or estates. Priests, sacred kings, and the priesthood were the first caste. The priesthood was inseparably tied to the kingdom. The reign of an usurper, a rapist, or an idiot was considered to be an anomaly.

The second caste was that of professional warriors. The Indo-Europeans knew no equals in this regard. They could fight and always did. The Indo-Europeans domesticated the horse and invented the chariot which, of course, they used to attack, to fight, and to win. With such a spirit, the Indo-Europeans created all of the states of Europe and many of the states of Asia. In some sense, thanks to the second caste, the Indo-Europeans gradually achieved world domination. Whether this is good or bad is another question. But it is a fact that they did. It is none other than warriors who create states, and the Indo-Europeans realized this superbly.

The third caste of the Indo-Europeans consisted of peasants and laborers. Among the nomadic peoples, such as the Scythians, Sarmatians, the Jasz, the Kushan, the Saka, the Parthians, and the Vedic Aryans, this caste was made up of herdsmen. Material production, wealth, food, and women belonged mainly to the third caste, i.e., they stood at the very bottom of the Indo-European hierarchy.

The priests and king corresponded to the sky, the warriors to the air, and the peasants to the land. The Indo-Europeans' whole system of values was founded on this, and thus it was for millennia. All types of Indo-European religions, societies, cultures, myths, tales, historical chronicles, and economic systems were built on this trifunctional, patriarchal model. This means that being an Indo-European means belonging to the society of priests, warriors, and laborers.

"But how does this relate to merchants, traders, and usurers?," you ask. In no way. Such kinds were despised in Indo-European societies. Capitalism appeared only once Indo-European values began to be rapidly forgotten, degraded, and degenerate. Indo-European societies also did not know equality, a sign

of degeneration. They did not know feminism or sodomy, by which differed the matriarchal lands and non-Indo-European cults such as the cult of Cybele.

European modernity, which abolished religion, faith in the King and the Heavenly Father, the castes, the sacred understanding of the world, and essentially patriarchy, was the beginning of the fall of Indo-European civilization. Capitalism, materialism, egalitarianism, and economism are all the revenge of those societies against which the Indo-Europeans waged war, subjugated, and strove to remedy, which composed the essence of all Indo-European peoples' history. Modernity was the end of Indo-European civilization. It naturally corresponds to the nadir. This is not an abstraction, for it affects us in the most direct ways.

All the best, you've been watching Dugin's Guideline on the deep crisis of Indo-European civilization.

No compromises will help us. Either we will disappear and be dissolved, or we must restore our Indo-European civilization in its entirety, with all of its values, ways, and metaphysics. If we want to preserve ourselves as a people, as an Indo-European people, we must wake up and be reborn in contrast to all that has been taken for granted in the world of modernity. To hell with this world of modernity.

© Jafe Arnold – All Rights Reserved. No reproduction without expressed permission.

The Logos of Europe: Catastrophe and the Horizons of Another Beginning

February 12, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

From the journal *Katehon*, no. 2 (2016), pp. 13-27.

Europe à la Dumézil

Modern European civilization is the historical continuation of Mediterranean civilization. The Indo-European element is predominant in this continuity, as the Indo-European tradition makes up Europe's main linguistic and cultural matrix. If we recall Dumézil's reconstruction of the trifunctional system here, then we immediately obtain a sociological map of Europe, the social structure of which is dominated by a constantly reproduced principle of three prevailing castes: priests, warriors, and producers. Indeed, we encounter none other than this stratification of European societies at the most different historical stages and under different names and titles.

The classic expression of this order was the ancient epoch of Mediterranean societies beginning with the Achaean conquests and Homeric Greece. Such a system was characteristic of Ancient Greece and Rome with the exception of periods of decline distinguished by a strengthening of the political positions of "urban dwellers", who represented a mixture of higher castes with uprooted peasants that gave birth to a new type of merchant hitherto alien to classical Indo-European societies. This type of merchant could have taken shape through the degradation and materialization of the warrior caste (which Plato describes in his *Republic* as the phenomenon of timocracy), or from below through a specific deviation from social type on the part of former peasants or urban artisans. It cannot be ruled out that this was the result of influences that were altogether foreign to the Indo-European cultural circle, such as Phoenician or, more broadly, Semitic cultures, for whom trade was a widespread social occupation. In the city-states of Greece, "urban dwellers" and "citizens", i.e., "townspeople", formed a specific social milieu in which the three classical functions of Indo-European society found parodical manifestation. In the very least, this is what Aristotle presented in his *Politics*. The authority of king-priests (the sacred

monarchy) transformed into tyranny. The domination of the warrior aristocracy gave way to domination by a financial oligarchy. The organic self-government of ethnically homogeneous and solidary communities (polity) became “democracy”, or the power of the sporadic and disparate crowd unified only by territory of urban residence.

Over the course of its rise, Rome restored the proportions of the Indo-European trifunctional hierarchy. However, periods of decline in the Roman Empire were characterized by similar phenomena of the rise of an undifferentiated urban majority. The spread of Christianity, which in and of itself is not a typically Indo-European cultural phenomenon, but rather bears essential features of the Semitic tradition, nevertheless spurred the rebirth of the Indo-European societies of the Greco-Roman world, the culmination of which became the European Middle Ages.

By the end of the Middle Ages, “civil society” once again raised its head, the role of the “trading caste” grew, and in the end the bourgeois Europe of England, Holland, and France finally set the normative democratic and social model. It is important that the main figure of this Europe of modernity is the bourgeois (the trader, entrepreneur, or businessman), who in classical Indo-European societies was either on the periphery or altogether absent. Detailed sociological analyses of the role and function of the bourgeois have been presented in the programmatic works of the famous European sociologists Max Weber [1] (in an apologetic spirit), and Werner Sombart [2] (from a critical standpoint).

Thus, according to Dumézil, modern Western-European civilization is Indo-European in its nature and initial structure, which means that it harbors at its core the trifunctional model. But modernity introduced into this structure and gradually established at its heart an element that is altogether genetically alien to Indo-European civilization and which conceptually conflicts with its classical matrix.

The decline of Europe à la Spengler, Danilevsky, and Sorokin

If Dumézil’s trifunctional analysis shows the divergence of the Europe of modernity from its Indo-European paradigm, then other authors practicing a civilizational approach – Spengler, Danilevsky, and Sorokin, etc. – are of the opinion that the cycle of European civilization has entered its stage of decline. The Romano-Germanic world, according to Danilevsky, is experiencing its old age, losing its vitality and energy, and is disintegrating into materiality and sensuality. Spengler, meanwhile, constructed his whole theory in order to substantiate the notion that the West’s Faustian spirit has led it to spiritual catastrophe, with the life of its culture fading away and being replaced by a purely technological and

alienated civilization. Pitirim Sorokin, for his part, argued that Europe in modernity has reached the end of its sensual stage in the development of its sociocultural system and is on the edge of the abyss.

All of these testimonies suggest that the contemporary moment of European civilization (whatever the scope of such might be for different authors) is its terminal phase, an era of decrepitude, decline, degradation, and agony. This means that the European Logos is in the final third of its cyclical manifestation, on the opposite end from Europe's childhood in Greco-Roman Antiquity and maturation in the European Middle Ages.

The desacralization of Europe (à la Guénon and Evola)

An even more brutal diagnosis of Europe of modernity was offered by the Traditionalists. According to Guénon, European Modernity has become an anti-civilization, an embodiment of all that is contrary to the spirit, Tradition, and sacrality. Secularization, humanism, naturalism, mechanism, and rationalism, in Guénon's view, are the essential manifestations of the spirit of perversion which affects all societies, but which only in modern Europe acquired such absolute and complete embodiment and was elevated to the level of a norm and principle. Traditional societies also knew periods of degradation, but modern Europe has built an anti-society in the fullest sense of the word, in which all normal proportions are inverted: the divine, transcendental dimension has been rejected; religion has been pushed to the social periphery, and matter, quantity, ephemerality, sensuality, individualism, and egoism have been elevated as the highest values.

Guénon argues that everything still related to Tradition in Europe is not actually European, and can in more pure and full form be found among the peoples of the East. What is genuinely European is the fragmentation of Tradition, its distortion and perversion, and its reduction to a lower, human, and rational level. Guénon treats the West literally, as the land where the sun of spirituality disappears and where onsets the "night of the gods." Nearly the same assessment of modern Europe is present in Evola, who nonetheless believed that the European tradition that existed in Antiquity and the Middle Ages with its roots in the heroic era can still be restored, and that the West can be saved from the abyss into which it has been plunged by modernity.

The restoration of this heroic spirit of the West was Evola's lifelong pursuit. But with regards to the Europe of modernity, Evola professed the most brutal and negative interpretations, believing that in this period we are dealing with an Anti-Europe with its ultimate degeneration and self-parody. Evola

considered the bourgeoisie to be a decadent class, and democracy, rationalism, scientism, and humanism to be forms of a spiritual and socio-political disease.

Guénon and Evola both saw a completely and deeply desacralized Europe, but Evola hoped for the opportunity of resacralization, whereas Guénon thought such unlikely, thus predicting for Europe an imminent and inevitable death.

The gender index of modern Europe

Different authors diverge profoundly when it comes to determining the “gender index” of modern European civilization. On the one hand, according to Bachofen and Wirth’s logic, Europe is founded on patriarchy and patriarchal tendencies (Appolonianism, the domination of masculine rationality) which only increase in relation to gravitating away from ancient matriarchy. Modernity, in the form of rationalistic philosophy and science, at first glance confirms this assessment. Indeed, many philosophers of life have proceeded from this analysis (from Friedrich Nietzsche to Henri Bergson, Ludwig Klages, Max Scheler, Georg Simmel, Theobald Ziegler, Hermann Keyserling, etc.), thus calling for liberation from “paternal domination” in European culture. On the other hand, Julius Evola and some other thinkers, such as Otto Weininger, have pointed out that modernity elevated to the position of priority precisely such materialistic, sensual, and empirical values which are rather typical of the feminine cosmos. Evola therefore insisted on his thesis that we live in the age of the Kali-Yuga, in which the principles of “black womanhood”, chaos, confusion, and death, which correspond to the most negative aspects of the feminine element, are celebrated.

In this sense, Europe is the focal point of “black gynocracy”, the kingdom of the goddess Kali where there is no place for the truly masculine and heroic element. If the origins of the European tradition lay, according to Evola, in the heroic masculine type, then European modernity is the direct antipode of this type. On this matter, however, theorists of civilization have expressed the most contradictory opinions.

Euro-optimism

All of these points of view are typical of those authors who tend to consider European civilization as one among multiple civilizations. Even those who define themselves as supporters of modern Europe (such as Toynbee or Huntington) posited that modernity is not simply the antithesis of the classical

foundations of European culture, but one of the scenarios of its development. Therefore, they proposed to strengthen and defend Europe and its values in the spirit of moderate Western conservatism.

The vast majority of Europeans understand modernity completely differently, convinced as they are that Europe was the first to go the furthest along the only possible universal path of historical development, that European values are the best and universal, and therefore obligatory, that there is only one civilization – European – and that all the rest are the essence of half-baked-civilization, i.e., veiled barbarism or savagery, and that modernity promises a level of culture, philosophy, knowledge, technology, morality, law, economics, and socio-political development which fundamentally surpasses not only all the historical stages of non-European societies, but also everything that Europe was before. They treat the origins of European civilization itself positively only insofar as they have led to “blessed modernity”, whereas otherwise such are, compared to modernity, something imperfect, naive, or useless long since overcome by modernity, which features all the best and has rejected and overcome all the worse.

For this official worldview of the modern West, appealing to European antiquity or non-European societies makes no sense, insofar as the truth is contained in the present moment of Western (American-European) history that has developed in the vanguard of all of humanity. This truth must necessarily tomorrow become more perfect and complete than it is today. This theory of progress – even though it has been discarded to a considerable extent by the intellectual, philosophical, and humanitarian elite of the West over the past century – remains the dominant myth of Western politics, Western mass culture, Western economics, Western education, and the ordinary worldview of Western man.

The initial structure of the Mediterranean Logos: The radical victory of Apollo

Now let us relate these models of evaluating modern Western-European civilization to the structure of the three Logoi of Noomachy. But first we should consider one important fact. Mediterranean civilization, which modern Western civilization is and believes itself to be the continuation of, had not only a Greco-Roman and not only an Indo-European (if we consider the barbaric tribes of medieval Western Europe) character. Even the Greek Logos initially comprised Semitic-Phoenician influences, and the ethnocultural origin of the Middle Eastern cults of the Great Mother remains an open question. We have seen that Herman Wirth traced matriarchy back to proto-Indo-European roots with their center in the North Atlantic. According to Frobenius, this (thalasso-oceanic) cultural circle, with an emphasis on the number four, the symbolism of space, and matriarchy, represents the antithesis of the Indo-European civilizational style which considers the sun feminine and the month masculine. Spengler (and

Frobenius) traced the Indo-European cultural code back to patriarchic Turan, while Evola saw patriarchal heroism as at the origin of European classics. In any case, Semitic influence and matriarchal motives can (contrary to Herman Wirth's view) be considered a factor foreign to the normative European cultural code. This is indirectly confirmed by the teachings of the Gnostics who identified the "evil demiurge" as the Jewish God of the Old Testament. The followers of the Gnostic Basilides, who called for overcoming the demiurgical prison, said of themselves: "We are not Jews anymore, but not yet Hellenes." [3]

The spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire, with the incorporation of the Old Testament as the most important theological component of the new religion, undoubtedly increased the impact of Semitic culture on the European context, although the scope and depth of this Semitic element's influence can be evaluated variously. In the very least, at an early stage in the Christianization of the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages, this element did not manifest itself so actively and vividly, as the foundation of Christian society came to be formed by Hellenic philosophy and Roman legal culture, which continued the main line of Indo-European civilization.

Overall, we can envision the cycle of the Western Logos as running from the beginning of the second millennium B.C. (the Achaean invasion of the Mediterranean) to the 2000's A.D., i.e., to our time, which makes up approximately 4,000 years. It is only natural that over this enormous historical period, the Logos of Mediterranean civilization, even in its Indo-European dimension, changed many times. Nonetheless, some parameters have been preserved unchanged, or transformed along the trajectories peculiar to this civilization – Indo-European and Mediterranean on one end, and modern Western (Western-European) on the other.

We can say that here we are dealing with two polar sections of Noomachy: beginning and end. The same can be said about other civilizations, with which we will deal one by one. Here we are interested in Europe from its origins to the present moment.

There is no doubt that the harbingers of the primordial (Achaean) culture and their related Indo-European tribes in the West (Italy) and East (Anatolia) of the Mediterranean were vivid representatives of the trifunctional ideology, the civilization of the heroic type and masculine, patriarchal, sacred, and warrior-like society. It can be said that their Logos was primarily the light Logos, and Apollo (or his prototypes) and Zeus acted as its main personification in myth. This was heavenly Uranic philosophy dominated by the vertical, a series of male symbols, and diaeretic diurnal regime (according to Gilbert Durand). Therefore, we should presume an Apollonian element to be in the foundations and starting accord of Mediterranean civilization. This was not a result of evolution or the product of external influence. The ancestors of the Ancient Greeks who arrived in this area were (according to Guénon and

Evola) bearers of the solar Hyperborean cultural circle. At the very least, this solar Logos was the axis of the political and caste elite of Mediterranean civilization, i.e., its two higher castes – priests and warriors. The domination of the light Logos also affected those of the third function who, with Hellenization, absorbed the structures of Olympic-Uranic ideology.

But the Achaeans did not arrive in an empty place. This zone was once inhabited by peoples with a different culture and ideology (the Pelasgians, Minoans, etc.). This culture was most likely arranged in accordance with a matriarchal cultural code, the manifestations of which we meet in the Logos of Cybele and later epochs.

Bachofen, Wirth, and Frobenius' studies clearly showed that the very same Mediterranean area was once a cultural field dominated by the structures of the Great Mother. Therefore, the Indo-European, Achaean, Apollonian, and patriarchal Logos asserted its dominance in a space with a hitherto matriarchal-structured culture. The resulting collision between these two Logoi – the Logos of the Apollonian newcomers and the Logos of the matriarchal indigenous ones – i.e., this specific episode of Noomachy, concluded with the full and unreserved triumph of the Logos of Apollo. Mediterranean culture, as a matrix of European culture, was first and foremost, in an external sense, originally and fundamentally a culture of the light Logos. It can be said that Pythagoreanism and Platonism were moments of a conservative revolution, when the intellectual elite of the Hellenic world realized the need to systematize, classify, and “encyclopedicize” its fundamental code. But this Apollonian/Platonic cultural code was dominant and prevalent long before Pythagoras and Plato, being as it was the fundamental constant of this whole civilization as such, from the beginning to the end (that is, to its present state).

Mediterranean civilization was thus founded as the institution of the irreversible Olympic victory of the gods over the titans, of Apollo and Zeus over the creatures of the Great Mother, the light Logos over the black Logos, the world of ideas over a tract of space (χώρα).

In this situation, it is crucial to locate the intermediate Logos – the dark Logos of Dionysus. In the radical victory of Apollo over Rhea-Cybele, Apollo over Python, Olympus over Ortiz, and the gods over the titans, Dionysus was comprehended as a figure who stood on the side of the gods. Through him is channeled the communication between the ontological, teleological, cosmological, and gnoseological top and the ontological, teleological, cosmological, and gnoseological bottom – but on the conditions of the top. Apollo's domination in Mediterranean civilization determined the fate of Dionysus as well. He was conceptualized as a ray of heaven pointing towards earth and hell, as the beloved son of Olympian Zeus, as the sun descending into night. Hence the very choice of this god's gender. While androgynous

by virtue of his intermediate position, he is thought of as a male god, as a Groom and Savior. His trajectory is from there to here; he is the witness of the gods and a god among gods.

The Logos of Dionysus is the matrix of warriors and peasants. Hence his Indian campaign and accompanying vegetable cults. But his war and his agrarian cults are connected not to material efforts and workdays, but with game and holiday. He is the god of the mysteries which serve to raise the earthly, bring it up to the heavenly, and open up for the mortal the path to eternity. Apollo embodies the divine order that does not know chaos. He is the god of kings and priests, a god who does not tolerate impurity or compromise. He is the god of the upper horizon. He does not bring things to order, he is order.

Dionysus descends to chaos, ready to deal with what is imperfect, but he translates chaos into order, perfects the imperfect. His role in the Mediterranean civilization of the light Logos is also bright, although qualitatively darker than Apollo.

Dionysus acts as the guide for the second and even more so for the third caste of Indo-European society, as well as women who find themselves on the periphery of the patriarchal system, but who through the cult of Dionysus are integrated into the entire civilizational fabric.

Such is the initial and fundamental structure of Noomachy for the Mediterranean region (in its Hellenistic, and then Greco-Roman and Western European version). Such is the primary component of the Logos of Mediterranean civilization – it is dominated by Apollo; Cybele is completely subordinate to and suppressed by it; and Dionysus, fulfilling communication between the top and bottom of the noetic and cosmological topography, transmits mostly eidetic rays from heaven to the masses of the earth and the creatures inhabiting it.

Three views on the fate of the West

The starting accord of Mediterranean civilization predetermined the basic proportions of its historical being up to the present time. Therefore, when we speak of the “decline of Europe”, or the crisis of Western civilization, we consciously or unconsciously have in mind the crisis of the light Logos, the tragedy of Apollo. This is altogether explicitly discussed by Julius Evola, but something analogous was undoubtedly had in mind by all those other authors who have given Western civilization such a fatal diagnosis. Whether freely or instinctively, in speaking about the crisis of the West we mean the crisis of

the Apollonian West, the West which we know from Antiquity and the Middle Ages. This is Apollo being mourned by those recording the catastrophe of modern Western culture.

If this is so, then the final episode of the historical cycle of Mediterranean civilization should be considered the “departure of Apollo”, his “withdrawal”, “disappearance”, or “flight.” In this case, the starting point of Mediterranean civilization is the radical moment of Apollo’s victory over Cybele, and the final point is the one in which we find ourselves now with the weakening of Apollo, the fall of Apollo, the end of his reign. The enigmatic myths about the impending end of Zeus’ reign, which are related in particular to the tales of his swallowing of the female titan Metis and the birth of Athena, might be directly related to this. The end of Western civilization is the end of the rule of the light Logos of Apollo.

Thus, from the standpoint of the Logos of Apollo itself, this history is one of downward movement with higher and lower points. The high point is the beginning of Mediterranean culture, and the lowest is the current state of Western civilization. If we imagine this scheme more naturalistically, then in the first phase (the second millennium B.C.) we have an earlier stage, that of the childhood of Apollo, from the middle of the first millennium B.C. to the Middle Ages of Europe, where we have the maturity of Apollo (coinciding with the peak of Platonism), and the enfeeblement and degeneration of the light Logos in the rationalism of modernity up to the irrational agony of Postmodernity.

But if we now follow the same trajectory from the standpoint of the black Logos of Cybele, the picture turns out to be entirely different. The starting point is the subordination of the feminine to the masculine, so for the Logos of Cybele this Apollonian start is not really its own. The Logos of Cybele dates back to the distant pre-Indo-European past or to non-Indo-European, adjacent fields, such as the Egyptian or Semitic ones (if we restrict ourselves to the Mediterranean). Therefore, Cybele sees Apollo’s invasion as an episode that is quite recent in comparison to the deep, underground time of the Great Mother. She admits defeat in Titanomachy and Gigantomachy and mourns her children who fell at the hands of the Olympians. As Apollo’s power weakens, she is gradually liberated, the titans’ wounds are healed, and they slowly begin to make their way up to the Earth’s surface.

The first of the titans to rise to Olympus is Prometheus. This titan seeks to imitate the gods, to share his chthonic wisdom with them, and borrow their sacred skills of rule. For the Great Mother, time is progress, and this is wholly justified insofar as the titans’ strength grows in relation to the weakening of the gods. Modernity (“New Time”) is their time. By “progress” can be understood only the progress of chthonic and hypochthonic forces, the liberation of the ancient powers imprisoned in Tartarus. This is the revanche on Mount Othrys, the counterattack of the giants on the Phlegraean fields. This is the

humanism of Modernity. The end of Western civilization, and the drift towards this end is, for chthonic forces, true development, becoming, progress, and the nearing of long-awaited triumph.

On the other hand, the finale of such progress might be the "kingdom of the woman." [4] This coincides with the Hindu tradition's definition of the present time as the Kali-Yuga, the kingdom of the black goddess Kali. The Sibylline Books [5] contain a prophecy which specifically relates to Western civilization:

And thereupon [6]

Shall the whole world be governed by the hands

Of a woman

and obedient everywhere.

Then when a widow shall o'er all the world

Gain the rule, and cast in the mighty sea

Both gold and silver, also brass and iron [7]

Of short lived men into the deep shall cast,

Then all the elements shall be bereft

Of order, when the God who dwells on high

Shall roll the heaven, even as a scroll is rolled;

100 And to the mighty earth and sea shall fall

The entire multiform sky; and there shall flow

A tireless cataract of raging fire,

And it shall burn the land, and burn the sea,

And heavenly sky, and night, and day, and melt

Creation itself together and pick out

What is pure. No more laughing spheres of light,

Nor night, nor dawn, nor many days of care,

Nor spring, nor winter, nor the summer-time,

Nor autumn. And then of the mighty God

The judgment midway in a mighty age

Shall come, when all these things shall come to pass. [8]

Those for whom Western civilization is not in crisis simply do not belong to it by and large. They are not the voice of Western civilization, but the voice of the black Logos. Today only a non-European can be a Euro-optimist.

Now as for Dionysus. How does he see the fate of the West today? Everything is more complicated here. The zone of Dionysus, his kingdom, is located between the light Logos of Dionysus [sic – Apollo? – J.A.] and the black Logos of Cybele. He is identical to himself both in heaven and on earth – he is close to both natures: divine and human. Dionysus understands the logic of both patriarchy and matriarchy. But in Mediterranean culture, as we have seen, Dionysus turns out to be integrated into the model of Apollonian order and is the distributor of this order to the chthonic levels of being. Dionysus is the Savior, the Initiator. His place is in the army of gods. He has his own scores to settle with the titans, who tear him apart. The fate of Dionysus in the West is inseparable from that of Apollo. Therefore, in following this line, he also perceives modernity as “dark times”, and shares the fate of all the other Olympian gods. In this sense, we can speak of a “flight of Dionysus” (this god’s escape appears repeatedly in, for example, the story of Lycurgus, when he plunges into the sea).

However, Dionysus is not so rigidly bound to Apollo. In the Apollonian kingdom, he acts as the Son of the Father, but if we look at him from the other position, then he can be seen as the Son of the Mother. His link to Cybele, who is recovering from madness, opens from the other side. Here we are approaching a very complex and obviously even dangerous topic that can be formulated as “Dionysus and his double.” [9] The dark Logos which brings light to all those areas of the world which Apollo’s sun does not penetrate, can at “twilight” acquire disturbing traits. In these “twilights” (Wagner’s “twilight of the gods”, Nietzsche’s “twilight of the idols”, or Evola’s “twilight of the heroes”), he can be perceived as a “titan.” After all, Heraclitus said in fragment 15: “Hades is the same as Dionysus.” [10] The meaning of the Logos of Dionysus is that it is “not the same.” But the similarity remains... This is related to the “shadows of Dionysus” [11] and the ambiguity of certain decadent “Dionysian” themes which Gilbert Durand distinguishes in Postmodernity as characteristic attributes [12]. Hence Julius Evola’s apprehension regarding the figure of Dionysus and his endowment of Dionysian civilization with decadent traits that lead to the iron age (the Kali-Yuga). Here we can also recall Guénon’s idea of the “great parody” and “opening of the egg of the world from below”, as well as his warnings against the particular danger posed by certain sacred traditions which emphasize the intermediate cosmic level and are capable of discovering their destructive potential in the critical era of the end of the cycle. [13]

In this sense is important what we have said concerning the field of Dionysus in Mediterranean civilization and his fate. In the Great Mother’s view, this field is up for questioning, as in the case of the “male” half of the female androgynous Agdistis. Or it can change altogether, and instead of Dionysus the

Savior can arise the image of the “Savioress” [14]. This is “another Dionysus”, a non-European one, not the one whom we know from the classical era of history. This is an “other Dionysus”, “proto-Dionysus”, or “post-Dionysus.”

If for solar Dionysus the decline of Europe is this civilization’s midnight followed by a new dawn – the “return of Dionysus” – then for his chthonic double it is the attainment of a secret goal, the center of hell, and the aim is to fix time in its infernal climax, thus making hell eternal and everlasting.

In this case, unlike the straightforward and catastrophic view of the light Logos and the progressive titanism of the black Logos, the relationship of the dark Logos of Dionysus to modern Western (Western-European) culture becomes highly ambiguous, as it is based on the complex operation of the “differentiation of Dionysii.”

Footnotes:

[1] Weber, M. *Protestanskaiia etika i dukh kapitalizma. Izbrannye proizvedeniia*. Moscow: Progress, 1991.

[2] Sombart, W. *Burzhua*. Moscow: Nauka, 1994.

[3] Dugin, A. V. *Poiskakh temnogo Logosa*. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2013.

[4] The Christian apocalypse describes this with the symbol of the Babylonian harlot, the “purple woman.”

[5] *Knigi Sivill (Sobranie pesen-prorochestv, napisannykh neizvestnymi avtorami II v. do n.e.-IV v.n.e.* Moscow: Engima, 1996.

[6] After the coming of the titan Beliar.

[7] This is a clear allusion to the four ages of gold, silver, bronze, and iron, which end with the “kingdom of the woman.”

[8] Dugin produces his own translation and reproduces (in this footnote) for comparison the translation by M. Vitkovskaya and V. Vitkovsky found in *Knigi Sivill*, op. cit., pp. 50. The English translation provided here is from “The Sybilline Oracles” translated by Milton S. Terry in 1899 and published by sacred-texts.com in December 2001, lines 90-111.

[9] Dugin, A. *Radikalnyi subekt i ego dubl*. Moscow: Evraziiskoe Dvizhenie, 2009.

[10] English Heraclitus translation from heraclitusfragments.com

[11] Maffessoli, M. *L’Ombre de Dionysos, contribution à une sociologie de l’orgie*. Paris: Méridiens-Klincksieck, 1985.

[12] Durand, G., *Figures mythiques et visages de l’œuvre . De la mythocritique à la mythanalyse*. Paris: Berg International, 1979.

[13] It is in this sense that Guénon describes the degradation of the Egyptian tradition, some of the currents of which he calls “perverted Hermetism.”

[14] The theory of a “female messiah” can be found in the Jewish sect of Jacob Frank, who influenced a whole number of mystical organizations in Europe in the 18-20th centuries. See Novak, Ch. *Jacob Frank: Le faux Messie*. Paris: l’Harmattan, 2012.

THE LOGOS OF EUROPE: CATASTROPHE AND THE HORIZONS OF ANOTHER BEGINNING

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Europe à la Dumézil

Modern European civilization is the historical continuation of Mediterranean civilization. The Indo-European element is predominant in this continuity, as the Indo-European tradition makes up Europe's main linguistic and cultural matrix. If we recall Dumézil's reconstruction of the trifunctional system here, then we immediately obtain a sociological map of Europe, the social structure of which is dominated by a constantly reproduced principle of three prevailing castes: priests, warriors, and producers. Indeed, we encounter none other than this stratification of European societies at the most different historical stages and under different names and titles.

The classic expression of this order was the ancient epoch of Mediterranean societies beginning with the Achaean conquests and Homeric Greece. Such a system was characteristic of Ancient Greece and Rome with the exception of periods of decline distinguished by a strengthening of the political positions of "urban dwellers", who represented a mixture of higher castes with uprooted peasants that gave birth to a new type of merchant hitherto alien to classical Indo-European societies. This type of merchant could have taken shape through the degradation and materialization of the warrior caste (which Plato describes in his Republic as the phenomenon of timocracy), or from below through a specific deviation from social type on the part of former peasants or urban artisans. It cannot be ruled out that this was the result of influences that were altogether foreign to the Indo-European cultural circle, such as Phoenician or, more broadly, Semitic cultures, for whom trade was a widespread social occupation. In the city-states of Greece, "urban dwellers" and "citizens", i.e., "townspeople", formed a specific social milieu in which the three classical functions of Indo-European society found paradoxical manifestation. In the very least, this is what Aristotle presented in his Politics. The authority of king-priests (the sacred monarchy) transformed into tyranny. The domination of the warrior aristocracy gave way to domination by a financial oligarchy. The organic self-government of ethnically homogeneous and solidary communities (polity) became "democracy", or the power of the sporadic and disparate crowd unified only by territory of urban residence.

Over the course of its rise, Rome restored the proportions of the Indo-European trifunctional hierarchy. However, periods of decline in the Roman Empire were characterized by similar phenomena of the rise of an undifferentiated urban majority. The spread of Christianity, which in and of itself is not a typically

Indo-European cultural phenomenon, but rather bears essential features of the Semitic tradition, nevertheless spurred the rebirth of the Indo-European societies of the Greco-Roman world, the culmination of which became the European Middle Ages.

By the end of the Middle Ages, “civil society” once again raised its head, the role of the “trading caste” grew, and in the end the bourgeois Europe of England, Holland, and France finally set the normative democratic and social model. It is important that the main figure of this Europe of modernity is the bourgeois (the trader, entrepreneur, or businessman), who in classical Indo-European societies was either on the periphery or altogether absent. Detailed sociological analyses of the role and function of the bourgeois have been presented in the programmatic works of the famous European sociologists Max Weber [1] (in an apologetic spirit), and Werner Sombart [2] (from a critical standpoint).

Thus, according to Dumézil, modern Western-European civilization is Indo-European in its nature and initial structure, which means that it harbors at its core the trifunctional model. But modernity introduced into this structure and gradually established at its heart an element that is altogether genetically alien to Indo-European civilization and which conceptually conflicts with its classical matrix.

The decline of Europe à la Spengler, Danilevsky, and Sorokin

If Dumézil’s trifunctional analysis shows the divergence of the Europe of modernity from its Indo-European paradigm, then other authors practicing a civilizational approach – Spengler, Danilevsky, and Sorokin, etc. – are of the opinion that the cycle of European civilization has entered its stage of decline. The Romano-Germanic world, according to Danilevsky, is experiencing its old age, losing its vitality and energy, and is disintegrating into materiality and sensuality. Spengler, meanwhile, constructed his whole theory in order to substantiate the notion that the West’s Faustian spirit has led it to spiritual catastrophe, with the life of its culture fading away and being replaced by a purely technological and alienated civilization. Pitirim Sorokin, for his part, argued that Europe in modernity has reached the end of its sensual stage in the development of its sociocultural system and is on the edge of the abyss.

All of these testimonies suggest that the contemporary moment of European civilization (whatever the scope of such might be for different authors) is its terminal phase, an era of decrepitude, decline, degradation, and agony. This means that the European Logos is in the final third of its cyclical manifestation, on the opposite end from Europe’s childhood in Greco-Roman Antiquity and maturation in the European Middle Ages.

The desacralization of Europe (à la Guénon and Evola)

An even more brutal diagnosis of Europe of modernity was offered by the Traditionalists. According to Guénon, European Modernity has become an anti-civilization, an embodiment of all that is contrary to the spirit, Tradition, and sacrality. Secularization, humanism, naturalism, mechanism, and rationalism, in Guénon's view, are the essential manifestations of the spirit of perversion which affects all societies, but which only in modern Europe acquired such absolute and complete embodiment and was elevated to the level of a norm and principle. Traditional societies also knew periods of degradation, but modern Europe has built an anti-society in the fullest sense of the word, in which all normal proportions are inverted: the divine, transcendental dimension has been rejected; religion has been pushed to the social periphery, and matter, quantity, ephemerality, sensuality, individualism, and egoism have been elevated as the highest values.

Guénon argues that everything still related to Tradition in Europe is not actually European, and can in more pure and full form be found among the peoples of the East. What is genuinely European is the fragmentation of Tradition, its distortion and perversion, and its reduction to a lower, human, and rational level. Guénon treats the West literally, as the land where the sun of spirituality disappears and where onsets the "night of the gods." Nearly the same assessment of modern Europe is present in Evola, who nonetheless believed that the European tradition that existed in Antiquity and the Middle Ages with its roots in the heroic era can still be restored, and that the West can be saved from the abyss into which it has been plunged by modernity.

The restoration of this heroic spirit of the West was Evola's lifelong pursuit. But with regards to the Europe of modernity, Evola professed the most brutal and negative interpretations, believing that in this period we are dealing with an Anti-Europe with its ultimate degeneration and self-parody. Evola considered the bourgeoisie to be a decadent class, and democracy, rationalism, scientism, and humanism to be forms of a spiritual and socio-political disease.

Guénon and Evola both saw a completely and deeply desacralized Europe, but Evola hoped for the opportunity of resacralization, whereas Guénon thought such unlikely, thus predicting for Europe an imminent and inevitable death.

The gender index of modern Europe

Different authors diverge profoundly when it comes to determining the "gender index" of modern European civilization. On the one hand, according to Bachofen and Wirth's logic, Europe is founded on patriarchy and patriarchal tendencies (Apollonianism, the domination of masculine rationality) which

only increase in relation to gravitating away from ancient matriarchy. Modernity, in the form of rationalistic philosophy and science, at first glance confirms this assessment. Indeed, many philosophers of life have proceeded from this analysis (from Friedrich Nietzsche to Henri Bergson, Ludwig Klages, Max Scheler, Georg Simmel, Theobald Ziegler, Hermann Keyserling, etc.), thus calling for liberation from “paternal domination” in European culture. On the other hand, Julius Evola and some other thinkers, such as Otto Weininger, have pointed out that modernity elevated to the position of priority precisely such materialistic, sensual, and empirical values which are rather typical of the feminine cosmos. Evola therefore insisted on his thesis that we live in the age of the Kali-Yuga, in which the principles of “black womanhood”, chaos, confusion, and death, which correspond to the most negative aspects of the feminine element, are celebrated.

In this sense, Europe is the focal point of “black gynecocracy”, the kingdom of the goddess Kali where there is no place for the truly masculine and heroic element. If the origins of the European tradition lay, according to Evola, in the heroic masculine type, then European modernity is the direct antipode of this type. On this matter, however, theorists of civilization have expressed the most contradictory opinions.

Euro-optimism

All of these points of view are typical of those authors who tend to consider European civilization as one among multiple civilizations. Even those who define themselves as supporters of modern Europe (such as Toynbee or Huntington) posited that modernity is not simply the antithesis of the classical foundations of European culture, but one of the scenarios of its development. Therefore, they proposed to strengthen and defend Europe and its values in the spirit of moderate Western conservatism.

The vast majority of Europeans understand modernity completely differently, convinced as they are that Europe was the first to go the furthest along the only possible universal path of historical development, that European values are the best and universal, and therefore obligatory, that there is only one civilization – European – and that all the rest are the essence of half-baked-civilization, i.e., veiled barbarism or savagery, and that modernity promises a level of culture, philosophy, knowledge, technology, morality, law, economics, and socio-political development which fundamentally surpasses not only all the historical stages of non-European societies, but also everything that Europe was before. They treat the origins of European civilization itself positively only insofar as they have led to “blessed modernity”, whereas otherwise such are, compared to modernity, something imperfect, naive, or useless long since overcome by modernity, which features all the best and has rejected and overcome all the worse.

For this official worldview of the modern West, appealing to European antiquity or non-European societies makes no sense, insofar as the truth is contained in the present moment of Western (American-European) history that has developed in the vanguard of all of humanity. This truth must necessarily tomorrow become more perfect and complete than it is today. This theory of progress – even though it has been discarded to a considerable extent by the intellectual, philosophical, and humanitarian elite of the West over the past century – remains the dominant myth of Western politics, Western mass culture, Western economics, Western education, and the ordinary worldview of Western man.

The initial structure of the Mediterranean Logos: The radical victory of Apollo

Now let us relate these models of evaluating modern Western-European civilization to the structure of the three Logoi of Noomachy. But first we should consider one important fact. Mediterranean civilization, which modern Western civilization is and believes itself to be the continuation of, had not only a Greco-Roman and not only an Indo-European (if we consider the barbaric tribes of medieval Western Europe) character. Even the Greek Logos initially comprised Semitic-Phoenician influences, and the ethnocultural origin of the Middle Eastern cults of the Great Mother remains an open question. We have seen that Herman Wirth traced matriarchy back to proto-Indo-European roots with their center in the North Atlantic. According to Frobenius, this (thalasso-oceanic) cultural circle, with an emphasis on the number four, the symbolism of space, and matriarchy, represents the antithesis of the Indo-European civilizational style which considers the sun feminine and the month masculine. Spengler (and Frobenius) traced the Indo-European cultural code back to patriarchic Turan, while Evola saw patriarchal heroism as at the origin of European classics. In any case, Semitic influence and matriarchal motives can (contrary to Herman Wirth's view) be considered a factor foreign to the normative European cultural code. This is indirectly confirmed by the teachings of the Gnostics who identified the "evil demiurge" as the Jewish God of the Old Testament. The followers of the Gnostic Basilides, who called for overcoming the demiurgical prison, said of themselves: "We are not Jews anymore, but not yet Hellenes." [3]

The spread of Christianity throughout the Roman Empire, with the incorporation of the Old Testament as the most important theological component of the new religion, undoubtedly increased the impact of Semitic culture on the European context, although the scope and depth of this Semitic element's influence can be evaluated variously. In the very least, at an early stage in the Christianization of the Roman Empire and in the Middle Ages, this element did not manifest itself so actively and vividly, as the foundation of Christian society came to be formed by Hellenic philosophy and Roman legal culture, which continued the main line of Indo-European civilization.

Overall, we can envision the cycle of the Western Logos as running from the beginning of the second millennium B.C. (the Achaean invasion of the Mediterranean) to the 2000's A.D., i.e., to our time, which

makes up approximately 4,000 years. It is only natural that over this enormous historical period, the Logos of Mediterranean civilization, even in its Indo-European dimension, changed many times. Nonetheless, some parameters have been preserved unchanged, or transformed along the trajectories peculiar to this civilization – Indo-European and Mediterranean on one end, and modern Western (Western-European) on the other.

We can say that here we are dealing with two polar sections of Noomachy: beginning and end. The same can be said about other civilizations, with which we will deal one by one. Here we are interested in Europe from its origins to the present moment.

There is no doubt that the harbingers of the primordial (Achaean) culture and their related Indo-European tribes in the West (Italy) and East (Anatolia) of the Mediterranean were vivid representatives of the trifunctional ideology, the civilization of the heroic type and masculine, patriarchal, sacred, and warrior-like society. It can be said that their Logos was primarily the light Logos, and Apollo (or his prototypes) and Zeus acted as its main personification in myth. This was heavenly Uranic philosophy dominated by the vertical, a series of male symbols, and diaeretic diurnal regime (according to Gilbert Durand). Therefore, we should presume an Apollonian element to be in the foundations and starting accord of Mediterranean civilization. This was not a result of evolution or the product of external influence. The ancestors of the Ancient Greeks who arrived in this area were (according to Guénon and Evola) bearers of the solar Hyperborean cultural circle. At the very least, this solar Logos was the axis of the political and caste elite of Mediterranean civilization, i.e., its two higher castes – priests and warriors. The domination of the light Logos also affected those of the third function who, with Hellenization, absorbed the structures of Olympic-Uranic ideology.

But the Achaeans did not arrive in an empty place. This zone was once inhabited by peoples with a different culture and ideology (the Pelasgians, Minoans, etc.). This culture was most likely arranged in accordance with a matriarchal cultural code, the manifestations of which we meet in the Logos of Cybele and later epochs.

Bachofen, Wirth, and Frobenius' studies clearly showed that the very same Mediterranean area was once a cultural field dominated by the structures of the Great Mother. Therefore, the Indo-European, Achaean, Apollonian, and patriarchal Logos asserted its dominance in a space with a hitherto matriarchal-structured culture. The resulting collision between these two Logoi – the Logos of the Apollonian newcomers and the Logos of the matriarchal indigenous ones – i.e., this specific episode of Noomachy, concluded with the full and unreserved triumph of the Logos of Apollo. Mediterranean culture, as a matrix of European culture, was first and foremost, in an external sense, originally and

fundamentally a culture of the light Logos. It can be said that Pythagoreanism and Platonism were moments of a conservative revolution, when the intellectual elite of the Hellenic world realized the need to systematize, classify, and “encyclopedicize” its fundamental code. But this Apollonian/Platonic cultural code was dominant and prevalent long before Pythagoras and Plato, being as it was the fundamental constant of this whole civilization as such, from the beginning to the end (that is, to its present state).

Mediterranean civilization was thus founded as the institution of the irreversible Olympic victory of the gods over the titans, of Apollo and Zeus over the creatures of the Great Mother, the light Logos over the black Logos, the world of ideas over a tract of space (χώρα).

In this situation, it is crucial to locate the intermediate Logos – the dark Logos of Dionysus. In the radical victory of Apollo over Rhea-Cybele, Apollo over Python, Olympus over Ortiz, and the gods over the titans, Dionysus was comprehended as a figure who stood on the side of the gods. Through him is channeled the communication between the ontological, teleological, cosmological, and gnoseological top and the ontological, teleological, cosmological, and gnoseological bottom – but on the conditions of the top. Apollo’s domination in Mediterranean civilization determined the fate of Dionysus as well. He was conceptualized as a ray of heaven pointing towards earth and hell, as the beloved son of Olympian Zeus, as the sun descending into night. Hence the very choice of this god’s gender. While androgynous by virtue of his intermediate position, he is thought of as a male god, as a Groom and Savior. His trajectory is from there to here; he is the witness of the gods and a god among gods.

The Logos of Dionysus is the matrix of warriors and peasants. Hence his Indian campaign and accompanying vegetable cults. But his war and his agrarian cults are connected not to material efforts and workdays, but with game and holiday. He is the god of the mysteries which serve to raise the earthly, bring it up to the heavenly, and open up for the mortal the path to eternity. Apollo embodies the divine order that does not know chaos. He is the god of kings and priests, a god who does not tolerate impurity or compromise. He is the god of the upper horizon. He does not bring things to order, he is order.

Dionysus descends to chaos, ready to deal with what is imperfect, but he translates chaos into order, perfects the imperfect. His role in the Mediterranean civilization of the light Logos is also bright, although qualitatively darker than Apollo.

Dionysus acts as the guide for the second and even more so for the third caste of Indo-European society, as well as women who find themselves on the periphery of the patriarchal system, but who through the cult of Dionysus are integrated into the entire civilizational fabric.

Such is the initial and fundamental structure of Noomachy for the Mediterranean region (in its Hellenistic, and then Greco-Roman and Western European version). Such is the primary component of the Logos of Mediterranean civilization – it is dominated by Apollo; Cybele is completely subordinate to and suppressed by it; and Dionysus, fulfilling communication between the top and bottom of the noetic and cosmological topography, transmits mostly eidetic rays from heaven to the masses of the earth and the creatures inhabiting it.

Three views on the fate of the West

The starting accord of Mediterranean civilization predetermined the basic proportions of its historical being up to the present time. Therefore, when we speak of the “decline of Europe”, or the crisis of Western civilization, we consciously or unconsciously have in mind the crisis of the light Logos, the tragedy of Apollo. This is altogether explicitly discussed by Julius Evola, but something analogous was undoubtedly had in mind by all those other authors who have given Western civilization such a fatal diagnosis. Whether freely or instinctively, in speaking about the crisis of the West we mean the crisis of the Apollonian West, the West which we know from Antiquity and the Middle Ages. This is Apollo being mourned by those recording the catastrophe of modern Western culture.

If this is so, then the final episode of the historical cycle of Mediterranean civilization should be considered the “departure of Apollo”, his “withdrawal”, “disappearance”, or “flight.” In this case, the starting point of Mediterranean civilization is the radical moment of Apollo’s victory over Cybele, and the final point is the one in which we find ourselves now with the weakening of Apollo, the fall of Apollo, the end of his reign. The enigmatic myths about the impending end of Zeus’ reign, which are related in particular to the tales of his swallowing of the female titan Metis and the birth of Athena, might be directly related to this. The end of Western civilization is the end of the rule of the light Logos of Apollo.

Thus, from the standpoint of the Logos of Apollo itself, this history is one of downward movement with higher and lower points. The high point is the beginning of Mediterranean culture, and the lowest is the current state of Western civilization. If we imagine this scheme more naturalistically, then in the first phase (the second millennium B.C.) we have an earlier stage, that of the childhood of Apollo, from the middle of the first millennium B.C. to the Middle Ages of Europe, where we have the maturity of Apollo (coinciding with the peak of Platonism), and the enfeeblement and degeneration of the light Logos in the rationalism of modernity up to the irrational agony of Postmodernity.

But if we now follow the same trajectory from the standpoint of the black Logos of Cybele, the picture turns out to be entirely different. The starting point is the subordination of the feminine to the masculine, so for the Logos of Cybele this Apollonian start is not really its own. The Logos of Cybele dates back to the distant pre-Indo-European past or to non-Indo-European, adjacent fields, such as the Egyptian or Semitic ones (if we restrict ourselves to the Mediterranean). Therefore, Cybele sees Apollo's invasion as an episode that is quite recent in comparison to the deep, underground time of the Great Mother. She admits defeat in Titanomachy and Gigantomachy and mourns her children who fell at the hands of the Olympians. As Apollo's power weakens, she is gradually liberated, the titans' wounds are healed, and they slowly begin to make their way up to the Earth's surface.

The first of the titans to rise to Olympus is Prometheus. This titan seeks to imitate the gods, to share his chthonic wisdom with them, and borrow their sacred skills of rule. For the Great Mother, time is progress, and this is wholly justified insofar as the titans' strength grows in relation to the weakening of the gods. Modernity ("New Time") is their time. By "progress" can be understood only the progress of chthonic and hypochthonic forces, the liberation of the ancient powers imprisoned in Tartarus. This is the revanche on Mount Othrys, the counterattack of the giants on the Phlegraean fields. This is the humanism of Modernity. The end of Western civilization, and the drift towards this end is, for chthonic forces, true development, becoming, progress, and the nearing of long-awaited triumph.

On the other hand, the finale of such progress might be the "kingdom of the woman."^[4] This coincides with the Hindu tradition's definition of the present time as the Kali-Yuga, the kingdom of the black goddess Kali. The Sibylline Books ^[5] contain a prophecy which specifically relates to Western civilization:

And thereupon ^[6]

Shall the whole world be governed by the hands

Of a woman

and obedient everywhere.

Then when a widow shall o'er all the world

Gain the rule, and cast in the mighty sea

Both gold and silver, also brass and iron [7]

Of short lived men into the deep shall cast,

Then all the elements shall be bereft

Of order, when the God who dwells on high

Shall roll the heaven, even as a scroll is rolled;

And to the mighty earth and sea shall fall

The entire multiform sky; and there shall flow

A tireless cataract of raging fire,

And it shall burn the land, and burn the sea,

And heavenly sky, and night, and day, and melt

Creation itself together and pick out

What is pure. No more laughing spheres of light,

Nor night, nor dawn, nor many days of care,

Nor spring, nor winter, nor the summer-time,

Nor autumn. And then of the mighty God

The judgment midway in a mighty age

Shall come, when all these things shall come to pass. [8]

Those for whom Western civilization is not in crisis simply do not belong to it by and large. They are not the voice of Western civilization, but the voice of the black Logos. Today only a non-European can be a Euro-optimist.

Now as for Dionysus. How does he see the fate of the West today? Everything is more complicated here. The zone of Dionysus, his kingdom, is located between the light Logos of Dionysus [sic – Apollo? – J.A.] and the black Logos of Cybele. He is identical to himself both in heaven and on earth – he is close to both natures: divine and human. Dionysus understands the logic of both patriarchy and matriarchy. But in Mediterranean culture, as we have seen, Dionysus turns out to be integrated into the model of Apollonian order and is the distributor of this order to the chthonic levels of being. Dionysus is the Savior, the Initiator. His place is in the army of gods. He has his own scores to settle with the titans, who tear him apart. The fate of Dionysus in the West is inseparable from that of Apollo. Therefore, in following this line, he also perceives modernity as “dark times”, and shares the fate of all the other Olympian gods. In this sense, we can speak of a “flight of Dionysus” (this god’s escape appears repeatedly in, for example, the story of Lycurgus, when he plunges into the sea).

However, Dionysus is not so rigidly bound to Apollo. In the Apollonian kingdom, he acts as the Son of the Father, but if we look at him from the other position, then he can be seen as the Son of the Mother. His

link to Cybele, who is recovering from madness, opens from the other side. Here we are approaching a very complex and obviously even dangerous topic that can be formulated as "Dionysus and his double." [9] The dark Logos which brings light to all those areas of the world which Apollo's sun does not penetrate, can at "twilight" acquire disturbing traits. In these "twilights" (Wagner's "twilight of the gods", Nietzsche's "twilight of the idols", or Evola's "twilight of the heroes"), he can be perceived as a "titan." After all, Heraclitus said in fragment 15: "Hades is the same as Dionysus." [10] The meaning of the Logos of Dionysus is that it is "not the same." But the similarity remains... This is related to the "shadows of Dionysus" [11] and the ambiguity of certain decadent "Dionysian" themes which Gilbert Durand distinguishes in Postmodernity as characteristic attributes [12]. Hence Julius Evola's apprehension regarding the figure of Dionysus and his endowment of Dionysian civilization with decadent traits that lead to the iron age (the Kali-Yuga). Here we can also recall Guénon's idea of the "great parody" and "opening of the egg of the world from below", as well as his warnings against the particular danger posed by certain sacred traditions which emphasize the intermediate cosmic level and are capable of discovering their destructive potential in the critical era of the end of the cycle. [13]

In this sense is important what we have said concerning the field of Dionysus in Mediterranean civilization and his fate. In the Great Mother's view, this field is up for questioning, as in the case of the "male" half of the female androgynous Agdistis. Or it can change altogether, and instead of Dionysus the Savior can arise the image of the "Savioress" [14]. This is "another Dionysus", a non-European one, not the one whom we know from the classical era of history. This is an "other Dionysus", "proto-Dionysus", or "post-Dionysus."

If for solar Dionysus the decline of Europe is this civilization's midnight followed by a new dawn – the "return of Dionysus" – then for his chthonic double it is the attainment of a secret goal, the center of hell, and the aim is to fix time in its infernal climax, thus making hell eternal and everlasting.

In this case, unlike the straightforward and catastrophic view of the light Logos and the progressive titanism of the black Logos, the relationship of the dark Logos of Dionysus to modern Western (Western-European) culture becomes highly ambiguous, as it is based on the complex operation of the "differentiation of Dionysii."

Footnotes:

[1] Weber, M. Protestanskaiia etika i dukh kapitalizma. Izbrannye proizvedeniia. Moscow: Progress, 1991.

[2] Sombart, W. Burzhua. Moscow: Nauka, 1994.

[3] Dugin, A. V poiskakh temnogo Logosa. Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2013.

[4] The Christian apocalypse describes this with the symbol of the Babylonian harlot, the “purple woman.”

[5] Knigi Sivill (Sobranie pesen-prorochestv, napisannykh neizvestnymi avtorami II v. do n.e.-IV v.n.e. Moscow: Engima, 1996.

[6] After the coming of the titan Beliar.

[7] This is a clear allusion to the four ages of gold, silver, bronze, and iron, which end with the “kingdom of the woman.”

[8] Dugin produces his own translation and reproduces (in this footnote) for comparison the translation by M. Vitkovskaya and V. Vitkovsky found in Knigi Sivill, op. cit., pp. 50. The English translation provided here is from “The Sybilline Oracles” translated by Milton S. Terry in 1899 and published by sacred-texts.com in December 2001, lines 90-111.

[9] Dugin, A. Radikalnyi subekt i ego dubl. Moscow: Evraziiskoe Dvizhenie, 2009.

[10] English Heraclitus translation from heraclitusfragments.com

[11] Maffessoli, M. *L'Ombre de Dionysos, contribution à une sociologie de l'orgie*. Paris: Méridiens-Klincksieck, 1985.

[12] Durand, G., *Figures mythiques et visages de l'œuvre . De la mythocritique à la mythanalyse*. Paris: Berg International, 1979.

[13] It is in this sense that Guénon describes the degradation of the Egyptian tradition, some of the currents of which he calls "perverted Hermetism."

[14] The theory of a "female messiah" can be found in the Jewish sect of Jacob Frank, who influenced a whole number of mystical organizations in Europe in the 18-20th centuries. See Novak, Ch. *Jacob Frank: Le faux Messie*. Paris: l'Harmattan, 2012.

Translator: Jafe Arnold

From the journal *Katehon*, no. 2 (2016), pp. 13-27.

The Metaphysical Factor in Paganism

May 17, 2019

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Appendix to Ways of the Absolute (2nd ed., Moscow: Arktogetia, 1999). Text originally written in 1990.

Those traditions which it is customary to call “pagan” are characterized not so much by an actual polytheism as by an immanentism which permeates all of their aspects. In the opinion of the monotheistic religions, the theological sinfulness of “paganism” is obvious: it ignores (whether consciously or inertially) the one transcendent and apophatic (i.e., formulated in negative terms) principle, the recognition and unconditional worship of which constitutes the sine qua non of monotheism. Among the three monotheistic religions, Judaism and Islam hold to this line altogether consistently, whereas Christianity alone takes significant steps in the other direction by asserting the central figure of its cult and dogma to be the immanent hypostasis of the Divine, God the Son. At the same time, Christians have also inherited the Abrahamic argumentation of the other branches of monotheism against “pagans.”

Yet, in our opinion, it would be wrong to reduce all of the differences between monotheism and non-monotheism to the recognition of the supremacy of the transcendent principle, since within the monotheistic traditions themselves there have unceasingly appeared currents which, while unconditionally recognizing the justness of transcendentalism, confer a special metaphysical value to immanent realities, thus being de facto in solidarity with the “pagan” position. We have in mind first and foremost the esoteric dimensions of the Abrahamic religions (Sufism and extreme Shi’ism in Islam, Kabbalah in Judaism, and Hesychasm in Christianity), where the accent invariably falls on the immanence of the Divine Presence. Thus, without ignoring the transcendence of the transcendent, the immanent can be metaphysically accented.

What are the deep reasons which condition this?

An answer to this crucial question would not only rehabilitate paganism, but would also illuminate the most mysterious and secret sides of the “non-pagan” traditions. In one of his public lectures, Geydar Dzhemal precisely defined this problem when he noted that there is a profound opposition, one which has determined the dialectics of sacred history over the last millennia, between the Abrahamic concept of faith as a super-ethical volitional act turned “from here to there”, and the “pagan” concept of the Empire as an expression of the immanent divine force running “from there to here.” The monotheistic

inspiration undermines the immanent grounds of the Empire, while the “pagan” force of immanent sacrality in turn deprives monotheism of its uniqueness and uncompromising nature. If the metaphysical truth of transcendentalism is obvious, then where do pagans find justification for their doctrines? What is the secret of the immanent Empire?

Without claiming to offer a complete (much less exhaustive) exposition of this most complex problem, we shall express a few considerations which might help somewhat clarify the essence of the matter. The sphere of the immanent is always de facto a sphere of multiplicity regardless of whether the question at hand concerns the real multiplicity of the manifest or merely the primordial duality of being and non-being inherent to the highest region of ontology, where pure being confronts the transcendent and the non-being encompassing it. This whole sphere is subject to the law of “metaphysical entropy”, according to which every logically ensuing metaphysical modality must obviously be lower in quality than the previous, that is to say inferior on the level of “metaphysical energy.” Monotheism begins with this statement and affirms the principle of transcendent unity, which confronts the whole volume of immanent multiplicity. This principle is organically connected to non-being, since transcendentalism inversely correlates to the sphere of the immanent, which means on the higher plane pure being that encompasses and synthesizes everything immanent. This apophatic, negative unity of non-being is the most logical, metaphysical response to the fact of “entropy.” Remaining within the framework of this picture of metaphysics, asserting anything else as a higher reality is simply absurd, since such would be tantamount to denying the finiteness of being and denying death which, in reality, exists as a quality dominating all metaphysical levels with the exception of non-being itself, which corresponds to the deepest essence of death itself. The most vulnerable point of transcendentalism is the very foundational picture of metaphysics and its basic postulate, the fact of entropy.

Many “pagan” traditions, especially the most metaphysically developed of them – Hinduism – are perfectly aware of the impeccable logic of monotheistic metaphysics, yet still carefully avoid the use of the term “monotheism” with regards to themselves. But by abandoning the upper pole of monotheism, they also renounce its lower immanent component, namely, the understanding of being as multiplicity, as a sphere of entropy. Both poles are thus denied with the same persistence. On the doctrinal level, this can be seen most easily of all in the relationship of both doctrines to the emergence of being. Monotheism in all of its variants is inevitably associated with “creationism”, i.e., the conceptualization of creation as alienation. Paganism in turn invariably insists on “manifestationism”, i.e., on the concept of manifestation and the self-discovery of the principle in being. The essence of the difference between these two traditions lies in the determination of the relationship between being and its hidden source in non-being. Creationism argues that being (and in rarer cases, the cosmos or even the visible universe) arose as a result of the separation of “part” of non-being, a part doomed from the first moment of creation to relate to its source as towards something different from itself. Creationism thus postulates a fundamental and “naturally irremovable”, radical Otherness of creation from its transcendent creator.

Manifestationism, on the other hand, denies this radical Otherness, instead asserting the oneness and substantiveness of the manifest and its unmanifest source. Being here is understood not as part of metaphysically preceding non-being, but as its being-other, as its means of “existing” (naturally, the word existing here is used here as a not too appropriate metaphor).

Thus, if in the first case the very unknowable essence of the Creator is the absolute answer and absolute completion of metaphysics, then in the second case the supremacy of the source of manifestation over itself is relativized, and the problem of being as a fact is not annulled, but rather remains a constantly open question (as in Parmenides’ thesis “Being cannot not be”). In this pagan perspective, there is no horizon of death, since death decides nothing, but only postpones or transfers the same question to a new level. Pagan traditions emphasize the consequence of this inner logic to be an aspect of the transmigration of beings that is conditioned by the fatal inevitability of the problem of being, which is not annulled by returning to the source.

This non-monotheistic approach does not place the manifest above the un-manifest, but merely radicalizes the question of the aim of manifestation, its mission, and the message it contains. It takes this question to its final limits. The finiteness of being is not assigned any decisive importance here, since the non-absoluteness of this finiteness is fixed and does not give any satisfactory answer to the reason and meaning of its emergence. In this perspective, being itself ceases to be the reign of descent and entropy and becomes the expression of some kind of special, metaphysically un-obvious truth. It is precisely for this reason that the principle of oneness thus loses all of its significance and, from a redeeming transcendent horizon, turns into some kind of self-evident statement, a statement of the obvious, the true, but the insufficient. On the other hand, multiplicity itself acquires a purely qualitative character: it is no longer a diluted and “entropic” unity, but the fabric of the gnostic message, in which every detail and every symbol is important and irreplaceable. Thus arise the “gods”, “angels”, and “messengers”, the spokesmen of the special gospel, the sender and addressee of which remain metaphysically unknown within both being and non-being. Thus arises as the crown of pagan metaphysics the notion of “Atman”, the subject, the living, immanent “god”, the qualitative which cannot be exhausted by the determining of being or non-being, that which participates in both but is not identical to one or the other. The subject is the special figure of the non-monotheistic tradition; it is the center of the imperial worldview, the concentration of its essence.

Thus, the subject is the summative, synthesized term of paganism without which the pagan perspective simply loses its *raison d’être*. This subject coincides in essence with the two other emphatically immanent modalities of Tradition defined by the terms “spirit” and “light.” It is no coincidence that where traditional doctrines emphasize the terms “light”, “spirit”, and “I”, we are dealing with what

monotheism frequently defines as “pagan heresy” or the “heresy of paganism.” This can be seen in the names of various gnostic groups, such as the Brotherhood of the Free Spirit, the Children of Light, etc. In addition, the very Sanskrit term Atman means both “spirit”, “I”, and “self.” It is also curious that, beyond Abrahamic, creationist monotheism’s cursing of “pagans and gnostics”, even the Zoroastrians found their “light gnosis” of Mani to be “heretical.”

However, the “light of the subject” is not an analogue or even a synonym of the “light of being.” It is a completely different light of an absolutely different quality. It is the “light of the problem” born out of the fact of the co-existence of being and non-being regardless of whether this existence is real (i.e., when being *de facto* is) or potential (i.e., when being is *de facto* “already not” or “not yet”). Hinduism specifies that alongside the Atman (the subject in being) there is the Paramatman (the subject in non-being). Thus, gnostic-“pagan” immanentism is an immanentism of an altogether different nature, one which is irreducible to any one of the modalities allocated by monotheism.

But does this immanentism remain really immanent? After all, in contrast to the strictly monotheistic optic, this immanentism cannot be satisfied by the transcendent member of the monotheistic dyad (the creator) as the metaphysical final and supreme. However, it does not follow that creation is not a final and exhaustive answer for immanentism. The immanentism of the “problem of light” can be explained by the need to merely fix the very fact of being, thereby not allowing it to disappear in the inexorable logic of monotheistic “ethics.” Here being serves as none other than “proof” of the non-absoluteness of being, and both being and non-being are no longer divorced (as in monotheism), but are fused together, thus becoming one and the same pole of the problem facing a complete Other, without which and outside of which this great problem would not exist. If this is so, then immanentism becomes in fact an expression of the highest and most convincing metaphysical transcendentalism, in which the transcendent quality is borne not out of the monotheistic Creator (who is metaphysically identical to non-being), but something beyond him himself, something so distant and great that it assigns to cause and effect equal metaphysical rights, thereby by making both into but a lower pole of the problem that is turned into the absolute and unattainable top.

In this perspective, the whole “pagan” (or more precisely, immanentist) complex acquires an altogether special meaning. Manifestation and its structure, which are accentuated and thoroughly deciphered by “paganism”, cease to be a not so important consequence of the Creator, who is valuable only relatively and with certain reservations. Rather, these questions become the text of the problem that is of equal significance to both creation and the Creator himself. Hence logically arises the goal of manifestation which, by the very fact of its presence (or the possibility of its presence), testifies (with the means of qualitatively lower principles compared to the principle of non-being) to something that is incomparable and eternal and which is superior to this non-being.

It is precisely in this sense that the “pagan” universe is theomorphic or, even more precisely, “angelomorphic.” Its elements are essentially revelations of the “world of light” beyond non-being, beyond the Creator. If we attentively examine the quality of this angelomorphic, “pagan” universe, we see that there is no opposition between the gnostic “anti-demiurgic” pathos and the immanentist accents of “paganism.” The “anti-demiurgism” of the gnostics can be explained by the rejection of the understanding of the actuality of the Creator as a single answer to the question of the purpose of creation. Such “anti-demiurgism” is polemical and takes aim first and foremost at monotheistic metaphysics, at the very founding logic of this metaphysics. From this perspective, the gnostics were essentially extreme transcendentalists. But the negative nature of the demiurge – or, more precisely, his complete dissatisfaction with the quality of the universal answer – does not diminish anything in the mission of manifestation, which in and of itself is the gnostic attack against its creator, its author. The sign that is encrypted in the cosmos and worshipped in “paganism” is immanent and visualized only as immanent. But this “pagan” immanentism is actually equivalent in its conclusions and in its very logic and source of impulse to gnostic transcendentalism. After all, there can be no suggestion that non-being is insufficient within its own pure self-identity. Such an argument could be drawn up only out of the deep deciphering of its antithesis (being), which reveals its dissatisfaction on the one hand (as the Creator of something imperfect) and on the other reveals certain transcendent potentials which remain problematic and hidden under the metaphysical status quo, but which could also awaken in the form of the light dimension of the universe, as the resurrecting immortal spirit, the eternal “I” of the Savior.

The gods of “paganism” are the subjective parameters of manifestation. They are not so much self-sufficient and self-satisfying principles in the likes of the God of monotheism as much as they are angels in the etymological sense, i.e., “messengers”, “spirits.” In accordance with this logic, John the Theologian, in his most esoteric gospel, utters a phrase which is completely alien to orthodox creationist monotheism: “God is spirit.” Within the framework of pure monotheism, such a downgrading of the principle, the source of all things spiritual and material, to merely one modality, to the spirit, sounds akin to blasphemy. In the pagan perspective, on the other hand, it is difficult to say anything more true and more just. It is no coincidence that it was John the Theologian who became the patron of European Christian esotericism.

In the Christian perspective, the Holy Spirit is the Consoler, the Paraclete, the main deputy in being of other hypostases which are absent in a given moment. For example, before the coming of the Son Christ, he “speaks through prophets”. After Christ’s Ascension, he “consoles and instructs” the once again orphaned world. Only thanks to him are the mysteries of the Church realized. The Holy Spirit of Christianity is the most immanent hypostasis of the Divine, and it is the identification of this hypostasis with the essence of the Divine that is beckoned by John the Theologian’s formula.

Finally, there is one final metaphysical aspect of paganism which ought to be emphasized. Every paganism is necessarily eschatological. This statement may surprise some, given that it outwardly contradicts the above. After all, the “pagan” approach to metaphysics is not obliged to especially accentuate the problem of the end of the world, the end of being, insofar as the absorption of manifestation by the principle not only says nothing to “metaphysical paganism”, but only “annoyingly” postpones the resolution of the great problem without adding anything substantive to it.

However, there is one fundamental consideration which makes eschatologism a necessary and extremely important component of immanentist tradition as a whole, which indeed has a place in the majority of historical “pagan” traditions, especially Aryan paganism. The eschatologism of immanentist doctrines is radically different from the monotheistic positive appraisal of the end of being to be the end of illusion and, as follows, an element of the absolute, unbroken fullness in the bosom of the principle of non-being.

Paganism envisions for the end times not a return to a unity lost in manifestation, but a return to primordial duality. It is no accident that Zoroastrian cycology calls the final stage of sacred history *vicharishn*, literally “separation.” Only at the moment of contact between being and non-being is the pagan revealed the whole depth of his doctrine, with all the paradoxical implications. This border realized at the final point of manifestation is the point of departure for the questioning of the subject, who here can only view both metaphysical realities (both exhaustive being and incumbent non-being) as something that does not principally satisfy him, hence his turn to the source which might be beyond both being and non-being.

On the pragmatic level, eschatologism is an essential feature of metaphysically fully-fledged paganism, since the true immanentism of authentic tradition cannot and should not be a doctrine of absoluteness and the non-transcendence of “this world”, which would render it an anti-tradition and anti-nomist materialism. For the subject of pagan immanentism, being is not the final sought-after shore or “paradise.” Rather, it is a symbol of the fact that non-being itself is not this “paradise.”

Thus, pagan tradition has no illusions as to the finiteness of being. On the contrary, this finiteness and non-absoluteness, taken and recognized as such, is attractive to this tradition in being. Hence, eschatology naturally becomes the center of the pagan worldview, guarding pagan metaphysics from fetishism and the inertial worship of being.

The true “pagan” Empire, as well as the true ‘pagan’ subject, are necessarily eschatological. The power which emanates “from there”, on which every true Empire rests, is not a banal affirmation of the identity of being with itself. The “pagan” component in metaphysics is charged with a paradoxical and truly transcendent “energy” which leads much further than the impeccable and unique, yet limited power of faith. This is made especially clear in the critical moments of the unfolding of being, in radical eschatological moments – only then can pagan metaphysics fully demonstrate its deepest foundations.

The Metaphysical Factor in Paganism

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Those traditions which it is customary to call “pagan” are characterized not so much by an actual polytheism as by an immanentism which permeates all of their aspects. In the opinion of the monotheistic religions, the theological sinfulness of “paganism” is obvious: it ignores (whether consciously or inertially) the one transcendent and apophatic (i.e., formulated in negative terms) principle, the recognition and unconditional worship of which constitutes the sine qua non of monotheism. Among the three monotheistic religions, Judaism and Islam hold to this line altogether consistently, whereas Christianity alone takes significant steps in the other direction by asserting the central figure of its cult and dogma to be the immanent hypostasis of the Divine, God the Son. At the same time, Christians have also inherited the Abrahamic argumentation of the other branches of monotheism against “pagans.”

Yet, in our opinion, it would be wrong to reduce all of the differences between monotheism and non-monotheism to the recognition of the supremacy of the transcendent principle, since within the monotheistic traditions themselves there have unceasingly appeared currents which, while unconditionally recognizing the justness of transcendentalism, confer a special metaphysical value to immanent realities, thus being de facto in solidarity with the “pagan” position. We have in mind first and foremost the esoteric dimensions of the Abrahamic religions (Sufism and extreme Shi’ism in Islam, Kabbalah in Judaism, and Hesychasm in Christianity), where the accent invariably falls on the immanence of the Divine Presence. Thus, without ignoring the transcendence of the transcendent, the immanent can be metaphysically accented.

What are the deep reasons which condition this?

An answer to this crucial question would not only rehabilitate paganism, but would also illuminate the most mysterious and secret sides of the “non-pagan” traditions. In one of his public lectures, Geydar Dzhemal precisely defined this problem when he noted that there is a profound opposition, one which has determined the dialectics of sacred history over the last millennia, between the Abrahamic concept of faith as a super-ethical volitional act turned “from here to there”, and the “pagan” concept of the Empire as an expression of the immanent divine force running “from there to here.” The monotheistic

inspiration undermines the immanent grounds of the Empire, while the “pagan” force of immanent sacrality in turn deprives monotheism of its uniqueness and uncompromising nature. If the metaphysical truth of transcendentalism is obvious, then where do pagans find justification for their doctrines? What is the secret of the immanent Empire?

Without claiming to offer a complete (much less exhaustive) exposition of this most complex problem, we shall express a few considerations which might help somewhat clarify the essence of the matter. The sphere of the immanent is always de facto a sphere of multiplicity regardless of whether the question at hand concerns the real multiplicity of the manifest or merely the primordial duality of being and non-being inherent to the highest region of ontology, where pure being confronts the transcendent and the non-being encompassing it. This whole sphere is subject to the law of “metaphysical entropy”, according to which every logically ensuing metaphysical modality must obviously be lower in quality than the previous, that is to say inferior on the level of “metaphysical energy.” Monotheism begins with this statement and affirms the principle of transcendent unity, which confronts the whole volume of immanent multiplicity. This principle is organically connected to non-being, since transcendentalism inversely correlates to the sphere of the immanent, which means on the higher plane pure being that encompasses and synthesizes everything immanent. This apophatic, negative unity of non-being is the most logical, metaphysical response to the fact of “entropy.” Remaining within the framework of this picture of metaphysics, asserting anything else as a higher reality is simply absurd, since such would be tantamount to denying the finiteness of being and denying death which, in reality, exists as a quality dominating all metaphysical levels with the exception of non-being itself, which corresponds to the deepest essence of death itself. The most vulnerable point of transcendentalism is the very foundational picture of metaphysics and its basic postulate, the fact of entropy.

Many “pagan” traditions, especially the most metaphysically developed of them – Hinduism – are perfectly aware of the impeccable logic of monotheistic metaphysics, yet still carefully avoid the use of the term “monotheism” with regards to themselves. But by abandoning the upper pole of monotheism, they also renounce its lower immanent component, namely, the understanding of being as multiplicity, as a sphere of entropy. Both poles are thus denied with the same persistence. On the doctrinal level, this can be seen most easily of all in the relationship of both doctrines to the emergence of being. Monotheism in all of its variants is inevitably associated with “creationism”, i.e., the conceptualization of creation as alienation. Paganism in turn invariably insists on “manifestationism”, i.e., on the concept of manifestation and the self-discovery of the principle in being. The essence of the difference between these two traditions lies in the determination of the relationship between being and its hidden source in non-being. Creationism argues that being (and in rarer cases, the cosmos or even the visible universe) arose as a result of the separation of “part” of non-being, a part doomed from the first moment of creation to relate to its source as towards something different from itself. Creationism thus postulates a fundamental and “naturally irremovable”, radical Otherness of creation from its transcendent creator.

Manifestationism, on the other hand, denies this radical Otherness, instead asserting the oneness and substantiveness of the manifest and its unmanifest source. Being here is understood not as part of metaphysically preceding non-being, but as its being-other, as its means of “existing” (naturally, the word existing here is used here as a not too appropriate metaphor).

Thus, if in the first case the very unknowable essence of the Creator is the absolute answer and absolute completion of metaphysics, then in the second case the supremacy of the source of manifestation over itself is relativized, and the problem of being as a fact is not annulled, but rather remains a constantly open question (as in Parmenides’ thesis “Being cannot not be”). In this pagan perspective, there is no horizon of death, since death decides nothing, but only postpones or transfers the same question to a new level. Pagan traditions emphasize the consequence of this inner logic to be an aspect of the transmigration of beings that is conditioned by the fatal inevitability of the problem of being, which is not annulled by returning to the source.

This non-monotheistic approach does not place the manifest above the un-manifest, but merely radicalizes the question of the aim of manifestation, its mission, and the message it contains. It takes this question to its final limits. The finiteness of being is not assigned any decisive importance here, since the non-absoluteness of this finiteness is fixed and does not give any satisfactory answer to the reason and meaning of its emergence. In this perspective, being itself ceases to be the reign of descent and entropy and becomes the expression of some kind of special, metaphysically un-obvious truth. It is precisely for this reason that the principle of oneness thus loses all of its significance and, from a redeeming transcendent horizon, turns into some kind of self-evident statement, a statement of the obvious, the true, but the insufficient. On the other hand, multiplicity itself acquires a purely qualitative character: it is no longer a diluted and “entropic” unity, but the fabric of the gnostic message, in which every detail and every symbol is important and irreplaceable. Thus arise the “gods”, “angels”, and “messengers”, the spokesmen of the special gospel, the sender and addressee of which remain metaphysically unknown within both being and non-being. Thus arises as the crown of pagan metaphysics the notion of “Atman”, the subject, the living, immanent “god”, the qualitative which cannot be exhausted by the determining of being or non-being, that which participates in both but is not identical to one or the other. The subject is the special figure of the non-monotheistic tradition; it is the center of the imperial worldview, the concentration of its essence.

Thus, the subject is the summative, synthesized term of paganism without which the pagan perspective simply loses its *raison d’être*. This subject coincides in essence with the two other emphatically immanent modalities of Tradition defined by the terms “spirit” and “light.” It is no coincidence that where traditional doctrines emphasize the terms “light”, “spirit”, and “I”, we are dealing with what

monotheism frequently defines as “pagan heresy” or the “heresy of paganism.” This can be seen in the names of various gnostic groups, such as the Brotherhood of the Free Spirit, the Children of Light, etc. In addition, the very Sanskrit term Atman means both “spirit”, “I”, and “self.” It is also curious that, beyond Abrahamic, creationist monotheism’s cursing of “pagans and gnostics”, even the Zoroastrians found their “light gnosis” of Mani to be “heretical.”

However, the “light of the subject” is not an analogue or even a synonym of the “light of being.” It is a completely different light of an absolutely different quality. It is the “light of the problem” born out of the fact of the co-existence of being and non-being regardless of whether this existence is real (i.e., when being *de facto* is) or potential (i.e., when being is *de facto* “already not” or “not yet”). Hinduism specifies that alongside the Atman (the subject in being) there is the Paramatman (the subject in non-being). Thus, gnostic-“pagan” immanentism is an immanentism of an altogether different nature, one which is irreducible to any one of the modalities allocated by monotheism.

But does this immanentism remain really immanent? After all, in contrast to the strictly monotheistic optic, this immanentism cannot be satisfied by the transcendent member of the monotheistic dyad (the creator) as the metaphysical final and supreme. However, it does not follow that creation is not a final and exhaustive answer for immanentism. The immanentism of the “problem of light” can be explained by the need to merely fix the very fact of being, thereby not allowing it to disappear in the inexorable logic of monotheistic “ethics.” Here being serves as none other than “proof” of the non-absoluteness of being, and both being and non-being are no longer divorced (as in monotheism), but are fused together, thus becoming one and the same pole of the problem facing a complete Other, without which and outside of which this great problem would not exist. If this is so, then immanentism becomes in fact an expression of the highest and most convincing metaphysical transcendentalism, in which the transcendent quality is borne not out of the monotheistic Creator (who is metaphysically identical to non-being), but something beyond him himself, something so distant and great that it assigns to cause and effect equal metaphysical rights, thereby by making both into but a lower pole of the problem that is turned into the absolute and unattainable top.

In this perspective, the whole “pagan” (or more precisely, immanentist) complex acquires an altogether special meaning. Manifestation and its structure, which are accentuated and thoroughly deciphered by “paganism”, cease to be a not so important consequence of the Creator, who is valuable only relatively and with certain reservations. Rather, these questions become the text of the problem that is of equal significance to both creation and the Creator himself. Hence logically arises the goal of manifestation which, by the very fact of its presence (or the possibility of its presence), testifies (with the means of qualitatively lower principles compared to the principle of non-being) to something that is incomparable and eternal and which is superior to this non-being.

It is precisely in this sense that the “pagan” universe is theomorphic or, even more precisely, “angelomorphic.” Its elements are essentially revelations of the “world of light” beyond non-being, beyond the Creator. If we attentively examine the quality of this angelomorphic, “pagan” universe, we see that there is no opposition between the gnostic “anti-demiurgic” pathos and the immanentist accents of “paganism.” The “anti-demiurgism” of the gnostics can be explained by the rejection of the understanding of the actuality of the Creator as a single answer to the question of the purpose of creation. Such “anti-demiurgism” is polemical and takes aim first and foremost at monotheistic metaphysics, at the very founding logic of this metaphysics. From this perspective, the gnostics were essentially extreme transcendentalists. But the negative nature of the demiurge – or, more precisely, his complete dissatisfaction with the quality of the universal answer – does not diminish anything in the mission of manifestation, which in and of itself is the gnostic attack against its creator, its author. The sign that is encrypted in the cosmos and worshipped in “paganism” is immanent and visualized only as immanent. But this “pagan” immanentism is actually equivalent in its conclusions and in its very logic and source of impulse to gnostic transcendentalism. After all, there can be no suggestion that non-being is insufficient within its own pure self-identity. Such an argument could be drawn up only out of the deep deciphering of its antithesis (being), which reveals its dissatisfaction on the one hand (as the Creator of something imperfect) and on the other reveals certain transcendent potentials which remain problematic and hidden under the metaphysical status quo, but which could also awaken in the form of the light dimension of the universe, as the resurrecting immortal spirit, the eternal “I” of the Savior.

The gods of “paganism” are the subjective parameters of manifestation. They are not so much self-sufficient and self-satisfying principles in the likes of the God of monotheism as much as they are angels in the etymological sense, i.e., “messengers”, “spirits.” In accordance with this logic, John the Theologian, in his most esoteric gospel, utters a phrase which is completely alien to orthodox creationist monotheism: “God is spirit.” Within the framework of pure monotheism, such a downgrading of the principle, the source of all things spiritual and material, to merely one modality, to the spirit, sounds akin to blasphemy. In the pagan perspective, on the other hand, it is difficult to say anything more true and more just. It is no coincidence that it was John the Theologian who became the patron of European Christian esoterism.

In the Christian perspective, the Holy Spirit is the Consoler, the Paraclete, the main deputy in being of other hypostases which are absent in a given moment. For example, before the coming of the Son Christ, he “speaks through prophets”. After Christ’s Ascension, he “consoles and instructs” the once again orphaned world. Only thanks to him are the mysteries of the Church realized. The Holy Spirit of Christianity is the most immanent hypostasis of the Divine, and it is the identification of this hypostasis with the essence of the Divine that is beckoned by John the Theologian’s formula.

Finally, there is one final metaphysical aspect of paganism which ought to be emphasized. Every paganism is necessarily eschatological. This statement may surprise some, given that it outwardly contradicts the above. After all, the “pagan” approach to metaphysics is not obliged to especially accentuate the problem of the end of the world, the end of being, insofar as the absorption of manifestation by the principle not only says nothing to “metaphysical paganism”, but only “annoyingly” postpones the resolution of the great problem without adding anything substantive to it.

However, there is one fundamental consideration which makes eschatologism a necessary and extremely important component of immanentist tradition as a whole, which indeed has a place in the majority of historical “pagan” traditions, especially Aryan paganism. The eschatologism of immanentist doctrines is radically different from the monotheistic positive appraisal of the end of being to be the end of illusion and, as follows, an element of the absolute, unbroken fullness in the bosom of the principle of non-being.

Paganism envisions for the end times not a return to a unity lost in manifestation, but a return to primordial duality. It is no accident that Zoroastrian cycology calls the final stage of sacred history *vicharishn*, literally “separation.” Only at the moment of contact between being and non-being is the pagan revealed the whole depth of his doctrine, with all the paradoxical implications. This border realized at the final point of manifestation is the point of departure for the questioning of the subject, who here can only view both metaphysical realities (both exhaustive being and incumbent non-being) as something that does not principally satisfy him, hence his turn to the source which might be beyond both being and non-being.

On the pragmatic level, eschatologism is an essential feature of metaphysically fully-fledged paganism, since the true immanentism of authentic tradition cannot and should not be a doctrine of absoluteness and the non-transcendence of “this world”, which would render it an anti-tradition and anti-nomist materialism. For the subject of pagan immanentism, being is not the final sought-after shore or “paradise.” Rather, it is a symbol of the fact that non-being itself is not this “paradise.”

Thus, pagan tradition has no illusions as to the finiteness of being. On the contrary, this finiteness and non-absoluteness, taken and recognized as such, is attractive to this tradition in being. Hence, eschatology naturally becomes the center of the pagan worldview, guarding pagan metaphysics from fetishism and the inertial worship of being.

The true “pagan” Empire, as well as the true ‘pagan’ subject, are necessarily eschatological. The power which emanates “from there”, on which every true Empire rests, is not a banal affirmation of the identity of being with itself. The “pagan” component in metaphysics is charged with a paradoxical and truly transcendent “energy” which leads much further than the impeccable and unique, yet limited power of faith. This is made especially clear in the critical moments of the unfolding of being, in radical eschatological moments – only then can pagan metaphysics fully demonstrate its deepest foundations.

Appendix to *Ways of the Absolute* (2nd ed., Moscow: Arktogeia, 1999). Text originally written in 1990.

The Radical Subject: Alexander Dugin on the Origins of His Philosophy

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

The following consists of excerpts from two appendices to the volume *The Radical Subject and its Double* (Moscow: Eurasian Movement, 2009), compiled on the basis of talks delivered at the New University in Moscow, Russia in 2004-2005.

The New Metaphysics in the Situation of Postmodernity

On the Article "Übermensch"

The New Metaphysics, which describes the ontological situation of extreme despair and the completely God-forsaken world, took shape in my consciousness in the early 1980s under the impression of my grasp of Traditionalist thought (Guénon, Evola, Schuon, etc.) and under the conditions of late Sovietism. Being attracted to the Hermetic tradition, I went to a chemical shop and asked for sulfur, mercury, and salt, to which the clerk replied with scant courtesy that they did not have any of the above, and that everything could only be distributed on approved ration coupons anyway. I didn't have any coupons, nor any permission. Thus, for the first time, I laid out the approaches to the "New Metaphysics" in an unpublished article written in 1985, *Sverkhchelovek* ("Übermensch"). The essential point of this article boiled down to reflecting on the Nietzschean definition of the *Übermensch*, as described in detail by Evola in his *Ride the Tiger*.

"The Victor over God and Nothingness" – I interpreted this formula as the essence of a special metaphysical program. "God is dead," exclaimed the madman in Nietzsche's work, "and we have killed him, you and I!" Man defeated God, and God retreated. This is desacralization. The sacred left. What is left? Nothing. After all, the sacred was the essence of everything, the center of being. After the death of God (victory over God), nothingness or "modern nihilism" (Nietzsche) was discovered.

The *Übermensch* is he who takes two steps forward to overcome – to overcome God (as an external absolute) and to overcome nothingness, that is the space of godless, desacralized, void reality which discovered its entropic status after the disposal of being. The *Übermensch* can take these two steps only by interiorizing the Absolute, by discovering the source of the sacred in himself – and this sacred is not borrowed nor participated in, but is spontaneously and sovereignly established through the experience of total emptiness and by passing through nothingness.

The end of the age of God is the transition from pre-modernity to modernity. The overcoming of traditional society yielded modernity. Afterwards, nothingness was exposed. This nothingness is modernity and its action directed against being as the center of the sacred, for there is no other being. Overcoming nothingness – the second step – gives rise to the *Übermensch*. The latter is a special quality which is to be found neither in Tradition nor in modernity. From this analysis it follows that the Superman is a figure of postmodernity – a key one at that, if we look at postmodernity not through the eyes of postmodernity itself, but through the eyes of Tradition which, albeit powerless, extremely accurately cognizes the meaning of the shifts which take place along the scale of Premodernity-Modernity-Postmodernity.

In essence, the article “*Übermensch*” was and remains the foundation of my metaphysical program for the past 20 years.

A bit later, in 1986-1987, I decided to develop the main provisions of this article into a more detailed work, *Templars of the Other*. This book ended up being too concentrated, and as a simplified, explanatory introduction to it in 1988 I wrote *The Ways of the Absolute*, and then as an explanation for *Ways of the Absolute* and as a projection of various individual provisions applicable to more specific fields, I wrote all my other books, all the way up to my current cycles of political science articles and remarks on Russian pop music (such as on the group Tatu, and so on). All of this was already implicit in my first article, “*Übermensch*.”

In the book *Templars of the Other*, the New Metaphysics was described in greater detail, but in a quite cumbersome manner and in a brutally heavy tongue completely devoid of any elegance.

The harsh theses of the article “*Übermensch*” flowed into a metaphysical picture.

The Content of *Templars of the Other* in Brief

We live in a world of Confusion which arose because the connections between the Cause and effect have been distorted and perverted. This gives rise to nihilism, the disposal of the Sacred, and de-ontologization. Things, torn from their roots, are distorted beyond recognition. Modernity is the finale of degradation, and there is almost nothing left.

The masculine element – that which generates, preserves, and destroys – has disappeared from reality. The hero is dead. There is only Tragedy in the world.

But how did the Cause allow these consequences to take off? How did God allow himself to be killed? How did the sacred agree to be removed? After all, there is no higher than the highest...Nevertheless, everything is as it appears to be as long as everything is developing as it is.

This mysterious, highest authority, which is higher than the highest itself, issued the decree for the trajectory of desacralization, ordered being to belittle itself, and sacrality to disperse itself. This authority was interested in the depth of being, in which it sought the mysterious, secret pearl. In order to find this, it was necessary to evaporate the sweet waters of life, to extinguish the heat of the ontological rhythm. This is what happened, and this means that a secret, mysterious hand guided from the highest height the world's whole path towards Confusion, Perversion, and Degeneration. The End of the World was conceived even before it began. In other words, in the very heart of being there is a strange will to create a territory free from itself. This territory, the nothingness of the modern world, has been created. Post-ontological conditions have set in.

Everything was carried away by the flow of entropy into non-being, oblivion. Everything lost its mind. The only thing that has not lost its head was a seed in snow-covered Moscow with a few volumes of Guénon and a few books of Nietzsche, compressed beyond bearable density, not existing, unknown, totally excluded, and with a being no larger than a match head. In this small point kindled a cold guess as to the Superman and the New Metaphysics, as to the fact that everything is not so coincidental.

By determining the operative parameters of nothingness, the New Metaphysics began to develop in the opposite direction. The thought of the Radical Subject confidently appeared.

The Awakening of the Radical Subject

The Radical Subject is the actor of the new Metaphysics, its pole. The Radical Subject appears when it is already too late, when all others and all else has disappeared. The Radical Subject cannot appear, because he is not planned. He is awakened by the Post-Sacred Will. The Post-Sacred Will is that something which does not coincide with the sacred, but does not coincide with nothingness. This is the main attribute of the Superman. Outside of the sacred, there is only nothingness. This means that there is no Post-Sacred Will. And yet such exists. Only in this mode can it exist.

Post-Sacred Will awakens the Radical Subject, and his awakening creates the Impossible Reality. My book *The Knights Templar of the Proletariat* described in sufficient detail how this awakening happens, how the Impossible Reality is created, and what moves the Radical Subject to accomplish. In some ways, the Radical Subject restores the sacred and returns being, but in some ways does not. All determinations of the New Metaphysics balance on blades. A certain frenzied thought and enraged will are clearly pumped up in such, but cannot be simply seized and deciphered.

Here is not the place to describe nuances. It is not yet time. Perhaps today these basic concepts of the New Metaphysics – the Radical Subject, Post-Sacred Will, and Impossible Reality – should be appended with more impressive, yet equally imprecise concepts, such as the Infinite End (Pan-Eschaton) and the Frantic Kingdom (Ecstatic Empire), which expand the synonymic chain of the Impossible Reality.

The New Metaphysics and Postmodernity

It is obvious, or almost obvious, that the metaphysical description of the situation of postmodernity somehow clearly resonates with the parameters of the New Metaphysics and its basic concepts.

The culture-transmitting cycle ranging from the commentaries attached to the article “Übermensch” through the books *Templars of the Other*, *The Ways of the Absolute*, *Mysteries of Eurasia*, the issues of *Sweet Angel* and *Elements*, the books *The Metaphysics of the Gospel*, *The Conservative Revolution*, *The Foundations of Geopolitics*, *The Knights Templar of the Proletariat*, *The Russian Thing*, and *The Evolution of the Paradigmatic Foundations of Science*, up to *The Philosophy of Traditionalism* and *The Philosophy of Politics*, has been fundamentally completed, although each of the themes and sub-themes addressed therein might freely be appended with explanatory expositions. In general terms, the Opus is finished, and everything has been based on the radical diagnosis given in the New Metaphysics. For such realities, 20 years is no time at all, mais quand meme...The return to the topic of “Übermensch” is ongoing.

The New Metaphysics resonates precisely with postmodernity. Between the New Metaphysics and postmodernity there is a deep connection. It is clear that such is not a sub-product of postmodernity, just as it is clear that such is no synonym of postmodernity. We can speak about the connection for sure, but the nature of this connection has to be clarified. Some operating modules are clearly available, but the elements of postmodernity demand heightened attention. Until its paradigm is fully clarified, describing and investigating it again and again will not be superfluous.

In so doing, we will come closer to the New Metaphysics, not directly, but spirally, rotating around its axis, whether we call such straight or not. Under the surface, it [the New Metaphysics] has been with us all these years. Evidently, it will be for centuries ahead and has been for centuries before, if not perpendicular to these centuries.

....

The “Victor over God and Nothingness” as the Axis of My Philosophy

Yet Nietzsche says that the “Übermensch is the victor over God and nothingness.” Why does this figure of Übermensch, who does not at all fit into the Traditionalist context, arise? Tradition reveals the figure of the Savior, the victor over the end times. But this is not the Übermensch, because the ontology of the Savior is undoubtedly transcendent and does not germinate from the “dissipating” subject. This is something other than the subject dissipating in the Kali Yuga...it is something fundamentally different from the main line of development of human history. Human history goes towards nothingness, and nowhere further, ending at this point. So who is this figure of the Übermensch which Nietzsche spoke of?

For 26 years I have been reflecting only on this phrase. I wrote my first programmatic article, “Übermensch”, about it in French. Then as a commentary to this article the unpublished book *Templars of the Other* was born, and then as a commentary to this unpublished work appeared the book *The Ways of the Absolute*; then I thought that everything would be quite clear, and yet everything appeared to be extremely complex. Then I wrote a commentary to each of my previous books. For example, the ironic cultural book *Pop-Culture and the Signs of the Times* was a commentary to *The Foundations of Geopolitics* and *The Philosophy of Traditionalism*, then *The Russian Thing* (the first half being from *The Knights Templar of the Proletariat*) was a set of remarks concerning National Bolshevism as an

extravagant version of the Conservative Revolution. The book *The Conservative Revolution*, in turn, illustrated the application of Traditionalist ideas to socio-political ideologies. *The Philosophy of Politics* systematized *The Russian Thing* in its political science dimension, while *Civics for the Citizens of the New Russia* brought all of these ideas to the level of Russian schoolchildren. Conspirology was a step into the realm in which Traditionalism intersects with political conspiracy theory, while *The Hyperborean Theory* studied the symbolism of Tradition and the theory of the “Nordic origins” shared by Guénon and Evola. The book *Mysteries of Eurasia* applied the principles of sacred geography to the spaces of Russia, while *The Metaphysics of the Gospel* clarified how Traditionalist ideas correspond to the Orthodox religion. All of these intersecting, circular commentaries, clarifications, and developments of certain topics and returns on different levels to original intuitions and plots, in one way or another (explicitly or implicitly) center around the topic of the Superman and the article of this name authored in my early youth. To this day, I am still streamlining, developing and commenting upon this small text written in French 20 years ago, interpreting it and providing additional testimonies and chains of reasoning...

The Solar Hounds of Russia

August 20, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Yulian Orlov

From part 5 of Tamplery Proletariata [The Knights Templar of the Proletariat] (Moscow: Arktogeya, 1997).

1. Terminus

The border circumscribes the State. It describes the State. In being its boundary, it determines the State.

Every thing is what it is thanks to its borders. After all, it is they that separate it from another thing. This distinction carries the most important meaning of the concept of the border not just for international law, defense doctrine, or the structuring of a country's armed forces, but also for philosophy as such. The border is not just an instrument of philosophy, but its essence, seeing as the highest philosophical concept – transcendence – in Latin literally means “that what lies on the far side of the border”.

The border externally reflects that which lies inside it, while simultaneously confining the essence of the thing in its confrontation with other things. The border is something sacred. The ancient Greeks knew a special god, Terminus, whose name meant ‘limit’, ‘border’. This was not just the guardian-deity of borders, but a “border-deity”, a kind of special, sacred concept that played a central role in the worldviews of the ancient Indo-European peoples.

In magic, there also exists the important concept of the “Guardian of the Threshold”, a special being that is located at the intersection of two worlds: the beyond and the present, the vulgar and subtle, that of

life and that of death, the waking world and the dreaming world. This is the very same ancient Terminus, with only slight modifications.

The hierarchy of the “guardians of the threshold” is described in particular detail in Tibetan tantric Buddhism. They are depicted as dakini, terrifying female creatures from the retinue of the goddess Kali or Tari. They throw themselves at a man the very moment he reaches a new level of existence: at the moment of completion of special rituals (especially the ritual of Chöd), during travels through abandoned places, immediately after death etc. It is as if the “guardians of the threshold” try to make sure that people and things remain themselves, to ensure that their inner “I” is preserved unmolested and steady. As soon as someone crosses a line, they are right there. The same could be said about the philosophical side of things. A thing exists through its concept, through a kind of awe-inspiring aureole of meaning and language that does not allow it to dissolve in the chaos of an unstructured, irrational reality. The border is adjoined to reason and reason’s secret nature. As an exclusively human and divine quality of the highest order, reason happens to manifest precisely through the erection of borders, definitions, confirmations of the essence of things and phenomena.

Thus, the border is the foundation of thought, the manifestation of the divine principle. God as such is limitless, ‘transcendental’; however, he reveals his divinity through the absence of those borders that He already affirms in being, in order to differentiate Himself from the not-Him and to ‘become known’ by the not-Him, even if partially.

If all of this is true, then the borders of the state and their defenders should be allocated an entirely distinct symbolism and execute a highly important, sacred mission that far and away transcends a purely utilitarian, administrative, military-strategic function.

Border guards are not just a type of soldier, but a kind of special, sacred quality. They are the modern adepts of the extremely ancient cult of the god Terminus.

2. Expansion: from tribe to Empire

The border as an index is not quantitative, but qualitative. The greater its volume and extension, the more universal and full-fledged the concept it expresses through itself. Therefore, as the concept (the definition, enclosure of space by the boundary) widens, it encompasses in itself a constantly growing number of individual aspects. In other words, everything that is included in the concept is

comprehended by the mind as a part, while it could earlier have been erroneously taken as a whole. The widening of the border of things and concepts is a dynamic process of the development of a single essence that clearly demonstrates the common part of something that earlier was present in two (or several) different things before a certain moment. Thus, the concept "animal" includes tigers, rabbits, mice, turkeys, elephants etc. "Animalness", "animality" lays bare its universality through the inclusion of all species and variants of living creatures, which themselves make the transition from the individual to the common.

The same happens in the state. A tribe or lineage has its territorial, cultural, linguistic etc. borders. These borders widen, stretching themselves out to the concepts 'people', 'nation', 'state'. Finally, the highest form of a state is the Empire. Its borders are enormous, they include the maximum possible number of natural human organisations: it has a place for tribes, lineages, cultures, religions, nations, ethnoi, and, in some cases, it can even accommodate likenesses of independent states (provinces, dominions etc.). As a form of state, the Empire is the highest category, comparable to the most sacred and all-encompassing gnoseological concepts such as "God", "Truth", "Good" etc. This is why the concept of the "Sacred Empire" is so durable. The sanctity of the Empire flows forth from the quality of its borders, which should incorporate some kind of absolute, universal knowledge, some kind of global mission that constitutes the essence of the imperial state as a historical and national community. For this reason, the borders of the Empire are directly linked to its fundamental theological orientation. The Roman Empire and its borders carried within them one spirit; the Empire of Alexander the Great another; the Arab Caliphate a third; Byzantium yet another; Rus a fifth and so on and so forth. The axial mission of the Empire also dictated the quality of its borders, be they maritime, riverine, overland, and located in mountain, steppe or desert... The highest idea of the Empire spilled out into the landscape and structure of the borders. Researching the transition from maritime to terrestrial borders allows us to trace the dynamics of the spiritual and social development of a society, and even to from time to time explain the most important religious, cultural, and economic transformations. Thus, only after the unification of all lands in a unitary state did England recognise itself as an Island, did it change its religion, transition to a maritime existence, and lay the foundation for capitalism and industrialisation (1). The movement from clan to Empire is not a political, but a spiritual process that is merely reflected in earthly reality. As borders expand and different landscapes, civilisations, religions, and ethnos are included into a unified geopolitical space, the discovery of a new, more universal Idea, that had earlier hidden itself under the kaleidoscopic manifold of the multitude, takes place.

3. Templars of the Great Wall

Based on the direct link between the sacred spirit of Empire and its borders, military units of border guards (warriors who were charged with the protection of the far reaches of the state) were formed in traditional civilisations. This link can be seen most clearly in the Knightly Order of the Temple, the

Templars, warrior monks and bearers of a special, universal knowledge. This esoteric knowledge was concentrated in the secret of common ratios that were capable of unifying different regions of the feudal medieval West, including Near-Eastern lands. The symbolism of the Templars does not only contain very ancient pre-Christian elements related to the sacred geography of Europe, but also doctrines drawn from esoteric Islam, especially from Sufism and heterodox Shiism. It is not by chance that the overwhelming majority of Templar commanderies were located next to megalithic structures which had once belonged to civilisations of more ancient eras. The Templars united the North and the South, the past and the future. The warriors of the Order executed a most important function: the safekeeping of the secrets of Western unity. Simultaneously, their conception of Islam opened up an opportunity for a truly imperial expansion beyond the boundaries of Europe, towards the south and south-east. Growing their esoteric competencies, the members of the Order potentially laid the foundation for an expansion of the State, of the Western Roman Empire. Once more, it is not by chance that with the destruction of the Order by Philip the Fair, United Europe collapsed for all eternity. The line of the Ghibellines and the Hohenstaufens [1] was defeated by the Guelphs, the Vatican, and divided nation states modelled after the centralist and absolutist France.

The Templars, as well as their analogues in other cultures, were a shield against the intrusion of the forces of hell, Gogs and Magogs of the Bible, into the Empire [2]. They defended sacred civilisation from streams of decomposition and sickness. It was this that was the goal of Alexander the Great's "iron wall". The very same symbolism forms the foundation of the Great Wall of China, as well as the ancient fortifications on the northern borders of the Roman Empire. When the Order of the border guards disintegrates, the foundations of imperial unity are undermined, the forces of chaos infiltrate civilisation, and, finally, a new collapse and Babylonian mixing of the tongues begin. The fall of the Empire is the catastrophe of the order of the border guards (in the physical as well as magical sense).

A brilliant illustration of the magical nature of border guard duty is given in the film "The Desert of the Tartars" [3]. In it, a mysterious, exclusively male collective (Mannerbund) of border guards awaits the advance of an enemy, an imaginary enemy, faith in the existence of which is seen by the border guards themselves as an obsessive, collective mania. One after the other, they fall to internal tension. Only the last of them, haggard from premonitions and visions, receives his reward: he becomes worthy of participating in a true miracle, during which the imagined enemy becomes a reality and its wild hordes attack the almost defenceless and abandoned fortress. The last templar against the hordes of Gogs and Magogs.

4. Cynocephalus

The Soviet Empire was an empire in the fullest sense. It was united by a common, universal idea: the idea of Socialism, in which the primordial Russian will to Truth and Justice manifested itself. The Soviet was a legitimate continuation of the Russian and the Orthodox, if only more universal, more common, more global. The archetype of border mysticism was entirely analogous to the traditional idea of the role of the Templars, the guardians of the threshold. The Soviet period was initially pregnant with a deep esotericism, which, however, was rarely expressed in a rational, open, and finished way.

To trace the trails of the Templar element in the concept of the Soviet Border Troops, we will turn to the most banal association possible: “the border guard and his trusty hound” [4]. The hound is not just an instrument of state security. It is something more: a symbol. The symbolism of the dog in the Tradition is tightly linked with the idea of the border in a wide sense, including in the metaphysical dimension. The dog guards the house, all the while located at the edge of the internal and the external. This animal is the incarnation of the “guardian of the threshold”, of an occult character, whose mission is the safekeeping of the selfsameness of the thing. Simultaneously, however, the dog also symbolised a crossing of borders, which is why it accompanied the soul of the deceased in shamanic rituals meant to help the dead travel to the other world. In other words, the dog is the animal manifestation of the god Terminus, the border deity. This is the origin of the very ancient myth about the origins of men and hounds. The Mongols and Turkic peoples state, that their ancestors were “yellow hounds”. The same belief remained among many North American Indians. The main hero of the Celtic national epos is Cú Chulainn, whose name means “the hound of Chulainn”. Even Christianity knows an image of the dog as a sacred symbol. For example, Dante uses the word *veltro*, “beagle”, to indicate a mysterious harbinger of the Second Coming, as well as the “Ghibelline emperor” (once again, a link with the Empire!). Monks of the Catholic Order of Saint Dominicus deciphered their name as “*Domin canes*”, “hounds of the Lord”. The same symbolism is found among the Egyptian cynocephali, divinities with canine heads, especially Anubis, the “guide of the dead”. The Greek Cerberus stems from the same origin. This symbolism allows us to form the following image: the border guard (the modern analogue of the Templar) is not just the master of the hound that he uses, but, in the spiritual perspective, becomes a projection of the Sacred Hound, a manifestation of Anubis, cynocephalic, a “yellow hound”. The animal and man “change places” as it were. Human individuality retreats in the face of a higher, magical function. Personality disintegrates in the mystery of the border.

Not the eagle, but the Hound’s Head should be the emblem of the border guards, the seal of a neo-Templar order, and, in turn, we involuntarily remember the attributes of Ivan the Terrible’s oprichniki...

5. Requiem

The fall of Empire is not just a socio-political catastrophe. It is a spiritual disaster. Along with the contraction of the borders, a collapse of the life-giving organic idea takes place. The highest philosophical spheres are struck. The parts lose their understanding of belonging to the whole, fall away from the life-giving centre, die off, and degenerate. The fall of the borders is the fall of concepts, ideas, a mental muddling. The fall signifies blood and the mixing of tongues. It is a deep catastrophe of the holy figure of the border guard. The forces of hell infiltrate the nation; the thief makes his way into the house; strife and numbness assault peoples. The cynocephalic god Terminus loses consciousness and distances himself. The chaos of spiritual night descends unto the Empire's people.

Empire is the good made manifest into endless borders. The end of Empire is evil, manifesting itself in the destruction of borders. This is national, state treason, but it is also more. The warriors who fell at the border, the templars of the Soviet Idea are betrayed by their successors and descendants; however, their magical acts are primordially mated to the mystery of thought. The fall of the borders is directly provoking a crisis of philosophy. The chaos of the Gogs and Magogs penetrates the mind. Idiots head the country's government.

The bastion of the spirit has fallen.

The gates of hell are open.

Hordes of enemies pour in through the crack in the great wall...

All is lost.

But the abandoned, betrayed, lonely and forgotten border guards of the Empire carry on their duty at far-flung posts. Islands of Orders lost in chaos, now meaningless guardians of the remains of a once truly Great Wall.

Forgotten on their half-smashed barriers, like Baudelaire's sailors. However, for the time being, like the hound of saint Dominic, they release fiery bursts of rage from their lungs. Tracer bullets into a light that has become darkness.

“Fiery air”. Ernst Jünger described it thus:

“Fiery air is necessary for the soul for it not to choke. This air makes a man die day and night in total solitude. The moment when youth feels that the soul is beginning to spread its wings, it is necessary that its view should be turned away from those mansards, away from those stores and bakeries, so that it can feel that there, deep below, on the edge of the unknown, in the no man’s land someone does not sleep, someone is guarding a banner, and that there is a watchman even at the farthest post.”

Dead or alive, with the head of a dog or a man, in a dream or in reality, “our men” are standing at the stumps of the border. They are the last who think for all of us. Guardians of a sold Idea. Watchmen of a no man’s land. Sentries of the farthest posts.

Within them is the beat of the pulse of the world, and of our Russia, which will rise again at the moment of the so very sweet, so very near Day of Judgement.

Footnotes:

*(1) See Carl Schmitt. “The Planetary Tension between Orient and Occident and the Opposition Between Land and Sea”, accessible [here](#).

Translator’s notes:

[1]: The Ghibellines and Guelphs were two warring factions in the Italian city-states during the 12th and 13th centuries; the former supported the Holy Roman Empire, while the latter defended the interests of the Papacy. The Hohenstaufens were a German noble lineage that produced several Holy Roman Emperors, the most famous of which was Frederick I Barbarossa. They were supporters of a strong Empire and involved themselves in the violence in Italy, until the destruction of the lineage in the 13th century. Further details on all parties listed above can be found in the excellent work by Julius Evola, *The Mystery of the Grail: Initiation and Magic in the Quest for the Spirit* (Inner Traditions: 1996).

[2]: Gog and Magog are two entities (which are sometimes collectives, and sometimes individual beings) that appear in several books of the Bible, as well as the Muslim tradition. They are always forces of violence, destruction, and chaos.

[3]: The film (based on the eponymous book by Dino Buzzati) can be found [here](#) (in Italian).

The Three Logoi: An Introduction to the Triadic Methodology of NOOMAKHIA

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Noomakhia and the Three Philosophical Countries

In the book *In Search of the Dark Logos* [1], we approached the existence of the Logoi as three views of the world or three fundamental paradigms of philosophy. We defined them as such:

The Light Logos = the Logos of Apollo

The Dark Logos = the Logos of Dionysus

The Black Logos = the Logos of Cybele

These three paradigms can be provisionally placed along a vertical axis between the “here” (ἐνταῦθα) and the “there” (ἐκεῖνα), between Earth and Heaven, between cause and effect, between the yield and the source, and so on. Each Logos builds its own universe and presents itself as the master and “demiurge.” Therefore, from a noological point of view, we are dealing not with one world but three whose paradigms conflict with one another and each encompass an infinite number of cosmic layers, hierarchies, and life cycles. It might be said that the Noomachy unfolds between these three Logoi in their vying for domination, and the reverberations of this primordial struggle are projected within these three noological universes, thus giving rise to internal battles, conflicts, splits, and oppositions. By virtue of implosion, this paradigmatic “three-way war” collapses each of the Logoi, immersing their content, structures, and “populations” into a funnel of fundamental catastrophes. Studying Noomakhia therefore demands a more careful dissection of these three Logoi. Each of them can be presented as a philosophical country, organized in accordance with certain rules with their own extended geography and topology of central and peripheral zones, and with a number of internal levels and both common and local hierarchies. These three noological countries are the country of Apollo, the country of Dionysus, and the country of Cybele (the Great Mother).

Gilbert Durand's Three Regimes of the Imagination: The Diurne

The Three Logoi under discussion can be visually correlated with the three regimes of the imagination described in the theory of the French sociologist and culturologist Gilbert Durand [2]. We devoted a separate work to Durand and his ideas, *Sociology of the Imagination: An Introduction to Structural Sociology* [3], in which we rather thoroughly examined these three regimes: the diurne, the dramatic nocturne, and the mystical nocturne. Developing Henry Corbin's central philosophical focus on the "imaginal" – that is the world of active imagination, the intermediate world between the corporeal and the spiritual, or the *alam al-mithal* of the Islamic tradition – Durand proposed the theory of the *imaginaire*, that is the "anthropological trajectory" of the structures located between the subject and object and organized in accordance with the prevalence of one or another dominant reflex. The *imaginaire* is structured in early childhood and later on determines the fundamental points of personality formation. Although the *imaginaire* necessarily encompasses all three regimes, one of them is always dominant and represses the others, thereby erecting the structure of consciousness in accordance with its own geometry and topology.

The domination of the postural reflex (which pushes the child up into the upright, vertical stance) organizes consciousness in accordance with the diurnal regime. This regime is dominated by diaeretic operations, such as division, dismemberment, the establishment of clear limits, contemplation, vertical hierarchy, severe logical laws, and is characterized by the concentration of identity towards one end (i.e., the construction of a consolidated subject) in parallel to the dissection (down to miasma) of the subject of perception at the opposite end (e.g., analyzing an object, dismembering a sacrificial animal, etc.). In the diurnal regime, the subject recognizes itself as a hero confronting time and death, with which it wages endless war. Vertical symmetries, images of flight (and fall), and masculine symbols such as the straight line, the sword, the scepter, the axis, arrows, light, the sun, and the sky are predominant in this mode. The diurnal regime fully corresponds to what we call the Logos of Apollo. This is the solar, masculine, heroic, noetic universe.

The Mystical Nocturne

The second mode of imagination, according to Durand, is completely opposite to that of the first. Durand calls this the mystical nocturne, and associates it with the nurturing reflex, with memories of the intrauterine state. When the *imaginaire* is captured by the structures of this mode, it perceives the world under the sign of the Night and the Mother. This regime is marked by the absence of clarity, as consciousness enjoys the continuous and unlimited tissue of hardly distinguishable things. Sensations of digestion, saturation, napping, comfort, stillness, gliding, and slight immersion are dominant. The

prevailing elements are water, earth, and warmth. The relevant symbols are the cup, the Mother, twilight, reduced objects, centripetal symmetries, the infant, the blanket, the bed, and the womb. This is the feminine, maternal regime. The mystical nocturne is based on radical feminization and is an antiphrasis. In this mode, dangerous and ominous phenomena (death, time, evil, threats, enemies, and misfortune, etc.) are given softer or contradictory names:

Death = dormition (literally falling asleep) or even birth (resurrection);

Time = progress, becoming, improving;

Threat = a game resolved in peace and bliss;

The enemy = a friend who is not dangerous, and to whose side one must necessarily cross as soon as possible (Stockholm syndrome)

Misfortune = happiness (a temporary challenge designed for something good), etc.

A person with a dominant mystical nocturne is prone to seek compromise, is distinguished by conformism and hyper-conformism, is peace-loving, easily adapts to any conditions, is feminine, is drawn towards serenity, and sets comfort, satiety, safety, and harmony above all else, believing that the best is guaranteed to come naturally. Here we can unmistakably recognize the structures of the Black Logos, the noetic world of Cybele, the Great Mother, and the chthonic worlds of the womb.

The Dramatic Nocturne

The third regime of the imaginaire is also nocturnal, but is dramatic, dynamic, and active. It can be placed between the diurne and the mystical nocturne. It is built on a copulative dominant, on rhythm, movement, and dual symmetries. Its symbol is the bisexual being, the Androgyne, a pair of lovers, choreia, the circle, dance, rotation, repetition, the cycle, motion returning to its origin.

The dramatic nocturne does not struggle with time and death like the diurne, and does not cross over to the side of time and death as the mystical nocturne does. It closes time in a cycle and keeps death in a chain of births and deaths regularly replacing one another (reincarnation). In this regime, the subject is reflected in the object and vice versa, and this game of reflections is reproduced in an infinite sequence. If the diurne is the masculine regime, the realm of the day, and if the mystical nocturne is the maternal realm of the night, then the dramatic nocturne correlates with twilight (dusk and dawn) and the male/female pair (sometimes united into one). While the diurne rigidly divides one from another (diaeresis) and the mystical nocturne unites everything (synthesis), the dramatic nocturne unites the divided and divides the united – never entirely, but retaining differences in their merger and sameness in division.

Those who have a dominant dramatic nocturne exhibit developed artistic abilities, psychological flexibility, eroticism, lightness, mobility, the ability to maintain balance in motion and to perceive events in the external world as a never-ending, shifting alternation of dark and light moments (the ancient Romans' *dies fastus/dies nefastus*).

Durand's dramatic nocturne perfectly fits the description of the Dark Logos, the noetic universe of Dionysus, the god who fuses opposites in himself – suffering and dispassion, death and resurrection, male and female, high and low, and so on. Hence precisely why the “search for the Dark Logos” led us to Dionysus and the broad complex of his situation.

The Three Worlds in Mythology

Mythology, in particular Greek mythology, provides us with abundant material for composing the three noetic spaces. The realm of the Light Logos corresponds to Olympus, the heavenly world, and the king of the gods, the thunder-god Zeus, his wife, Hera of the air, the solar Apollo, the warrior Athena, the goddess of justice Dike, and other analogous figures. This is the highest horizon of the celestial Olympian gods in the maximal purity in which the Greeks tried to imagine the gods free from chthonic or archaic elements. This series of gods can be called the diurnic series, for their primary realm of rule is the that of the day, wakefulness, the clear mind, the vertical symmetries of power, and purification.

The second realm of myth, corresponding to the mystical nocturne, is that of the chthonic deities associated with Gaia, the Great Mother. This includes the “Urania” of Rhea, the deputies of the titan Cronus and the mother of Zeus, all the generations of the Titans overthrown by the gods, as well as other creatures of the Earth, such as the Hundred-Handed Ones (Hecatoncheires), the giants, and other

chthonic monsters. To this category also belong some of the gods for one reason or another expelled from Olympus, such as Hephaestus. In this zone are situated the underworlds of Hades, and below it Tartarus. Here we should pay particular attention to the Titans, whose very nature reflects the characteristic attributes of the mystical nocturne. Moreover, the Titanomachy (like the Gigantomachy) can be seen as a mythological analogue of the “wars of the mind” by which we understand Noomachy. This Kingdom of Night also has its own philosophical geometry and is fundamentally opposed to that of the Day.[4] In Plato’s dialogue *The Sophist*, the philosophical aspect of the Gigantomachy is described in extraordinarily expressive terms:

Stranger: We are far from having exhausted the more exact thinkers who treat of being and not-being. But let us be content to leave them, and proceed to view those who speak less precisely; and we shall find as the result of all, that the nature of being is quite as difficult to comprehend as that of not-being.

Theaetetus: Then now we will go to the others.

Stranger: There appears to be a sort of war of Giants and Gods going on amongst them; they are fighting with one another about the nature of essence.

Theaetetus: How is that?

Stranger: Some of them are dragging down all things from heaven and from the unseen to earth, and they literally grasp in their hands rocks and oaks; of these they lay hold, and obstinately maintain, that the things only which can be touched or handled have being or essence, because they define being and body as one, and if any one else says that what is not a body exists they altogether despise him, and will hear of nothing but body.

Theaetetus: I have often met with such men, and terrible fellows they are.

Stranger: And that is the reason why their opponents cautiously defend themselves from above, out of an unseen world, mightily contending that true essence consists of certain intelligible and incorporeal ideas; the bodies of the materialists, which by them are maintained to be the very truth, they break up into little bits by their arguments, and affirm them to be, not essence, but generation and motion.

Between the two armies, Theaetetus, there is always an endless conflict raging concerning these matters. [5]

The third kingdom, situated between Olympus and Hades (Tartarus), is the domain of the intermediate gods. The undisputed king of this mythical realm is Dionysus, who descends into Hades as Zagreus and rises to Olympus as the resurrected Iacchus of the Eleusinian mysteries and Orphic hymns. Here should also be included the psychopomp god Hermes, the goddess of harvest and fertility Demeter, as well as the countless series of lesser gods and daimons – the nymphs, satyrs, dryads, silens, etc. Some of the Olympic gods, such as Ares and Aphrodite, also gravitate towards this intermediary zone. It is also here that the titans (such as Prometheus) break through in certain situations and strive upwards. Yet the most important aspect for our sake is that it is in this mythological kingdom that we find those people whom the Orphics believed to have emerged from the ashes, or from among the titans struck down by Zeus for dismembering and eating the infant Dionysus. The nature of people is therefore simultaneously titanic and divine, Dionysian. On the upper horizon, this nature touches the realm of the daytime gods of Olympus. On the lower horizon, it descends into the underworld, the nocturnal region of the titans.

Thus, we have acquired a mythological map of the three noetic worlds of interest to us. On the basis of carefully interpreting different tropes, histories, traditions, and legends, we can glean a vast amount of data relevant to our study of Noomakhia.

Philo-Mythia and Philo-Sophia

Insofar as from the very onset we have substantiated the necessity of distance from the “contemporal moment”, we can consider the zone of myth wholly and without any reservations as a reliable basis for our quest. We can treat philo-mythia (a term coined by the Brazilian philosopher Vicente Ferreira da Silva [6]) as a parallel scholarly field alongside philo-sophia. Nothing hinders us from reversing the progression from Mythos to Logos and studying the chain from Logos to Mythos. Moreover, it would be even more productive to consider the logological and the mythological as two equal types of narratives, especially since in Ancient Greece both terms, λέγω η μυθέω, meant discourses of different semantic shades. On the level of the paradigm of thinking, as considered outside of the classical version of the historical, the equal consideration of all types of discourses is wholly legitimate. In fact, this is precisely what we see in the works of Plato and the Neoplatonists, who easily transitioned from one method to another in order to be most understandable and convincing. The “contemporal moment” demands that we approach the logological side of Plato seriously (even descending to the level of his “naïve” idealism) and that we leave the mythological dimension aside, insofar as such simply reflects the “remnants and superstitions of the era.” But upon establishing distance from the contemporal moment, this whole

interpretive system collapses, and we can and should turn to the Mythos and Logos simultaneously, on common grounds, in search of what really interests us.

Moreover, on the basis of the Neoplatonic language systematically developed by Plotinus, we can propose the following terminological model. The basic paradigms of thinking (and that means the sources of philosophy) are to be placed not in the realm of the Logos, but in the realm of the Nous (voũç) which can be seen as the common source of both Logos and Mythos. The noetic precedes the logological as well as the mythical. The Nous contains the Logos, but is not identical to it. The Logos is one specific manifestations of the Nous. The Mythos can also be considered another specific manifestation of the Nous. Therefore, they are parallel to one other on the one hand, and have a common source on the other. We are interested in precisely the noetic section, those layers of thinking and being where this divergence has not yet established. Therefore, the parallelism between philo-mythia and philo-sophia is fully justified. Noomakhia can be described and cognized both as portrayed in the picture of Titanomakhia as well as in terms of the rational polemics of philosophical schools.

With regards to the interpretation of myths and describing the relationship between the “new gods” and “ancient titans”, it is also necessary to assume a correct position from the outset. Based on the fact of the eternity of the Mind, the voũç (or its analogue, the spirit, the Source, etc.) as the grounds upon which all non-modern (=traditional) and non-Western (=Eastern) doctrines and religious systems are built, the diachronic structure of myth can be considered a symbolic conventionality. We ought to understand the indication that the “Titans” existed (and reigned) before the gods, sub specie aeternitatis, either as a logical continuity, or as an indication of their place in the structure of the synchronic topology of the noetic cosmos. The Titans always existed, just as the Black Logos of Cybele or the regime of the mystical nocturne. “Before” means either “higher” or “lower” depending on the viewpoint of the zone of the noetic Universe where we stand. For Mother Earth, with respect to the Titans, “before” means “better.” For the Olympians, the converse is true, since they think of themselves as the “new gods” who have won eternity in contrast to the endless cycles of the Titans’ self-closing duration. From the standpoint of the Logos of Apollo, the Titans are “ancient” because they did “not yet” know eternity, and they dwell below because they will never know it. The discrepancy between the interpretation of the “before” and “after” is not simply the consequence of relative positioning, but an episode – and a fundamental one – of the Titanomachy, which is an expression of nothing more nor less than the choice of side in the never-ending battle of eternity against time. The war of the gods and titans is a war for the position of the “observatory point”, a war to control it. Those who determine the paradigm, the grille de la lecture, will rule. We thereby find ourselves in the very epicenter of the wars of the mind. The titans seek to overthrow the gods of Olympus in order to assert their Logos as the exemplary and normative one, while the gods insist on the triumph of the diurne. Therefore, the nature of any mythical figure or account depends on from what sector of the noetic cosmos we view such, and to which army we ourselves belong. And it is this belonging to an order of one or another divine leader that Plato lays out in his Phaedrus, where Socrates explains to Phaedrus that in the person we love, we

see the figure of the divine leader which our soul follows in its heavenly hypostasis. In the one we love, we love God and at the same time, in God, our higher "I."

It would be highly naive to suppose that all people choose the camp of the gods, the Logos of Apollo and the solar regime of the heroic diurne. If this was the case, the Earth would be Heaven. Some tend towards the chthonic forces of the Earth, in solidarity with the worlds of the Great Mother. Some intuitively or consciously see themselves as warriors of the army of Dionysus. As follows, we have the right to expect from such different treatments of myths, philosophical notions, and corresponding figures of Love between the three human types.

The Geometry of the Logoi

Let us imagine this picture as a whole in a diagram.

This mythological snapshot of the world can be interpreted in the most diverse ways. From a synchronic point of view, it is a map of three simultaneous regions of the world, each corresponding to the model of one of the three fundamental zones and three modes of the imagination. In this case, the Three Logoi represent three primordial positions of viewing the map of the Universe: from above (by Apollo and Olympus), from below (by Gaia, Cybele, and Tartarus), and from an intermediate position (that of Dionysus, Demeter, and humanity).

At the same time, it can be said that the basic figure of the Universe will change depending on the arrangement of this or that "observatory point." The Logos of Apollo believes itself to be the center, the foundation, the top of the triangle or the peak of Mount Olympus (Parnassus). The view from here is a view looking down upon the base of the triangle. The descending vertical of the solar Logos sets at the opposite end of itself its opposition – the flat, horizontal Earth. Hence the Delphic formula "thou art" and "Know thyself". The "I" is the "I" of Apollo, the peak of Olympus. And just as is the case with the path from the "I" to the "not-I", so should the path from the "not-I" (the earthly surface, the horizontal, and expanse) to the "I" be strictly vertical (the path of the hero up Olympus). The highest point in this logological and mythological geometry is deliberately given: all the rest is positioned as away from itself, and the solar rays it emits fall to rest upon the plane of Earth. In this picture, the Earth is necessarily flat, as it is seen from the peak of the world mountain.

The intermediary world of Dionysus is structured differently. Its height rises up to the heavens and its depth reaches down to the center of hell. Dionysus' center is in himself, while the above and below are the limits of his divine path – formed not by themselves, but over the course of the dramatic mysteries of his tragic, sacrificial death and victorious resurrection. The Logos of Dionysus is dynamic; it embodies the abundance and tragedy of life. Dionysus' universe differs radically from the Universe of Apollo, insofar as their different views yield different worlds. The Logos of Dionysus is a phenomenon, a mutable structure of his epiphany. It is far from chaos, but it is not the fixed order of Apollo. It is a kind of playful combination of both, a sacred flickering of meanings and minds constantly threatening to plunge into madness – a madness which is healed by the impulse towards the higher Mind. It is not the fixed triangle of the mountain, but the pulsating, living heart that composes the paradigmatic canvas of thinking.

The geometry of Cybele's Universe is completely different. On the one hand, in her we can see the inverted image of the Universal Mountain turned upside down into a sort of cosmic funnel. The symmetry between hell and heaven was vividly described by Dante. The Ancient Greeks believed that there is a black sky in Tartarus with its own (suffocating) air, its own (fiery) rivers and (foul) land. Yet this symmetry should be not merely visual, but also ontological and noological. The world of the titans consists of the refusal of the order of the diurne. The horizontal thus acquires the dimension of a downwards vertical, a horizontal of the depths. Differences fuse while identities are split asunder. Light is black, and darkness blazes and burns. If in the world of Apollo there is only the eternal "now", then Cybele's world is reigned by time (Kronos – Chronos), where there is everything but the "now", and instead only the "before" and "too late", where the main moment is always missed. The torture of Tantalus, Sisyphus, and the Danaids reflects the essence of the temporality of hell: everything is repeated to no end. The inverted triangle, as applied to the worlds of Cybele, is most akin to an inverse "Apollonian hypothesis" – and thus indeed Apollo understands this opposite to himself. Mother Earth thinks otherwise: she has no straight lines, no clear orientations. Attempts to separate one from the other cause her unbearable pain. Her thinking is muffled, gloomy, and inconsistent. She cannot break away from the mass which de-figures and repeatedly dissolves all forms, decomposes them into atoms and recreates them again at random. This is how monsters are born.

Therefore, the three views of the universe from these three positions represent three conflicting worlds, and it is this conflict of interpretations which constitutes the essence of the war of the minds.

The Philosophical Season

Looking at this model in static terms, we can also propose a kinetic interpretation. It is easily noticeable that the three synchronic worlds of this model can be taken to represent the calendric cycle: the upper half (the kingdom of Apollo) corresponds to summer, the lower world of Cybele to winter, and the intermediary worlds of Dionysus to autumn and spring. The latter can be interpreted as the cardinal points of the drama of Dionysus, his sacrificial killing, dismemberment, resurrection, and awakening. The fixed positional zones of the tripartite cosmos thus come to life and motion. The changing of the seasons becomes a philosophical process of intense thinking, a manifestation of cosmic war, in which the Logoi attack their opponents' positions. In winter, the earth strives to swallow light, to capture the sun, and to turn flowing waters into blocks of ice. In summer comes the celebration of order, fertility, creation, and life. The cycles of the Dionysian festivities mark the key moments in this drama: the withering and the new flourishing.

The Logoi thus enter into a dialectical confrontation, the spatial topography of which is embodied in a temporal sequence. Thus, the changing of seasons is revealed to be a process of philosophizing. The natural cycle is habitually considered to be the direct opposite of history, which consists of momentary, non-repeating events. The historical manifests itself where the cycle opens – this is the axiom of “axial time.” Therefore, the symbolism of the season is seen by “school philosophy” as the direct antithesis of philosophy as such. But this axiom is valid only and exclusively from the standpoint of the “contemporal point”, a view which is only possible if we recognize historicism as a dogmatic truth. By overturning this construct in the spirit of the revolution proposed by the Traditionalists, we can propose an alternative interpretive model: history can be seen as a great seasonal cycle with its own winters and springs, and as follows, its own intersections of the ontological territories of hell and heaven. There are epochs of Apollo, Dionysus, or the Great Mother which replace one another with a certain continuity, in each of which dominates one or another paradigm, one or another Logos, one or another “philosophical season.” The eras of Apollonian rule wield an orientation towards eternity and being, towards sacred tradition and the heroic architecture of life and consciousness. These are vertical epochs, in which the cosmic fire kindles itself (Heraclitus). There is no history in these eras, there is only the event – the epiphany of constant heavenly eternity.

The era of Dionysus balances between eternity and time. It celebrates sacred time in festivals, mysteries, initiations, and ecstatic rapture. This is open time – time from which one can step into eternity. But here there is already a notable dualism between periods of joy and periods of grief (the Triteira). Half of time passes amidst the “concealment” of god, his apophenia. God dies in order to be resurrected in the Great Dionysia. He is resurrected again and resides among people (epiphany), bestowing upon them the horror and dizziness of sacred being.

The epoch of Cybele knows neither Apollonian eternity nor the ecstatic enthusiasm of the dying and resurrecting god. It is monotone and solid. It contributes to all that is gigantic and super-dimensional in a

material sense but which is deprived of flight and free movement. It is in precisely this era of winter that lasting, “dragging” time is born, that which is incapable of transcendence. Here begins the reign of temporality.

Applying this theory of the philosophy of seasons to the foundational historical of modern Western philosophy, we reach an interesting conclusion. Is this “Western culture”, built on the very principle of temporo-centrism, not a sign of precisely this titanic earthly cycle? If we take into account the materialism and heightened and clearly unhealthy fixation of modern people on things and atomic (and ever more microscopic) phenomenon, the reign of quantity over quality, earthly over heavenly, and mechanical over organic, the preponderance of individualist fragmentation, including the aesthetic norms of contemporary art, then the notion that we find ourselves under the rule of the Black Logos seems to be a wholly probable supposition.

In this case, philosophy is revealed to be not a radical rupture with nature and its repetitive cycles (as the evidencia of the contemporal moment suggests), but the common, fundamental, and ontological matrix of the seasons themselves. Nature and its universal laws are thus but one form of the manifestation of the Nous and its conflicting Logoi – alongside geometry, philosophy, mythology, religion, culture, and “history.” The Nous organizes everything – both the structures of eternity and the structures of time, both natural transformations and human thinking, the trajectories of the flights of the gods and the counter-attacks of the titans. Thus, the calendar and its symbolism can by all means offer a philosophical reading. If this is a correct reading, then calendric symbolism can serve as a hermeneutic key to the comprehension of history, as has been nobly substantiated by the Traditionalist school. Guénon, Evola, and other representatives of Traditionalism univocally identified our epoch as that of the “Kingdom of Night”, the Kali-Yuga, the final age which corresponds on the synchronic, ontological map of the states of being to hell and its population. Something similar with respect to the meaning of modernity is affirmed by virtually all sacred traditions and religions. As soon as one refrains from interpreting Tradition and religion from the standpoint of the “contemporal moment”, and instead strives to determine the “contemporal moment” from the position of Tradition and religion, then everything immediately falls into place, and the anomalousness of our epoch is revealed in all of its volume. We live in the center of winter, at the bottom point of the Untergang, of descent. In this situation, it is easy to guess which Logos dominates over us, what “deities” are ruling us, and which mythological creatures and religious figures are leading today on a global scale in Noomakhia, in the wars of the mind.

The Philosophy of the First Logos: Platonism

Now we are left with pursuing the parallels between philo-mythia and philo-sophia to their logical end and proposing a systematization of the types of philosophy in terms of the mythological and seasonal maps of their paradigmatic universes. The choice of temporal sectors is more than broad enough to render this possible. However, we ought to act conventionally and therefore take as our point of departure that period which Heidegger called the "First Beginning of Philosophy", that of classical Greece. On the basis of the synchronism of our reconstruction of the Three Logoi, we should attempt to identify three philosophical schools which to one degree or another resonate with these three corresponding paradigms.

The philosophy of the diurne, of Apollonianism, and the heroic, light ascent is, without a doubt, to be found in Plato and Platonism. Here we have the highest form of this approach, the axiomatic formulas of the vividly expressed Light Logos. Plato's philosophy is built on the Apollonian triangle, from top to bottom, and represents the most perfect model of the embodiment of diurnic thinking. Plato himself was associated with the figure of Apollo (as was the founder of Neoplatonism, Plotinus, several centuries later). Plato was born on the day of Apollo's festival (May 21 / Targelion 7, 428 B.C.E.) and died on the very same day in 348 at a wedding feast.[7] To this Apollonian line should be also added the ontological philosophy of the Eleatics (Xenophanes of Colophon, Parmenides, and his student Zeno), as well as Pythagoras and his school.

The structure of Plato's philosophy meets all the requirements of the Apollonian Logos. At the top of his theory is the One, surrounded by eternal ideas. This is the peak of the divine, celestial world, illuminated by timeless light. The highest principle is the Good, which exudes its abundance firstly upon the world of ideas (paradigms) and then, through the good Creator-Demiurge, on the created cosmos. Plato described all three of these world zones in his *Timaeus*, in particular distinguishing the realm of paradigms (the observatory point of the gods, the Father), the realm of models, or "copies" and "icons" (the Son), and the mysterious khora (χώρα), the space or country which Plato likened to the Nurse or Mother. In describing the khora (which was later identified by the Neoplatonists with the mother), Plato's dialogue loses its crystal clarity, thus lending towards the strange assumption that this element can be comprehended only by means of a "special Logos", which Plato called "bastard" or "illegitimate" (νόθος λόγος) [8]. The vision of the celestial god thus reaches the surface of the earth, the lower limits of the world of copies, but here is confronted with its limits, as it can no longer see anything amenable to clear Apollonian discernment. At the border of the day, the realm of night-dreaming flickers. *Timaeus* (Plato) restricts himself to only a few suggestions and postulates the khora (space) to be a flat intermediary, beyond which there is nothing, and which is impossible to understand, insofar as there is nothing to properly understand in it. This khora is the view of the back of the Great Mother, a limit unreachable by the Apollonian, where hell begins. Alexander the Great, the disciple of Plato's disciple, Aristotle, repeated the same gesture when he erected at the Caspian Gates a copper wall which symbolically closed the gateway of the cosmos (=the ecumene) to the wild hordes of North Eurasia, e.g.,

Scythia, which in Greek sacred geography was considered to be under the control of the titans, hence the legend that the titan Prometheus was the king of the Scythians.

The Neoplatonists extracted all possible gnoseological, ontological, and theological consequences from Plato, thus crowning the nearly millennial existence of Plato's Academy with a complete and unique monument to Olympic, divine, heavenly thought. In a certain sense, Platonism is eternal, and has continued in both Christian theology by Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, John of Damascus, Dionysius the Areopagite, Maximus the Confessor, Michael Psellos, John Italus, and Gemistus Plethon in the East, and by Boethius and John Scotus Eriugena in the West), as well as in the Renaissance and even amidst modern philosophy.

Aristotle: The Teacher of the "New Dionysus"

The second Logos, the philosophy of Dionysus, can be discerned in Orphism, in the teachings of the Greek mysteries (especially the Eleusinian), and manifests itself most fully in Aristotle. If hardly any doubts arise with respect to the Apollonian qualification of Plato's philosophy, then the convergence between Aristotelianism and Dionysianism might seem, in the very least, strange and unwarranted. This is so only because Dionysus and Dionysianism are currently treated predominately through poetic, artistic, and aesthetic lenses or only with regards to the Bacchic orgies and ecstatic processes. If anything at all is established as corresponding to Dionysus, it is likely either the "philosophy of life", biologism, or, in the worst cases, hylozoism. This means that we are not at all ready to take Dionysius seriously as a philosopher and we do not accord full consideration to his structural function in the philosophy of the world. The point is that Dionysus, on the philosophical map of the Three Logoi, belongs to the middle world below the higher paradigms, models, and ideas and above the dubious and difficult to ascertain (for the Apollonian Logos) worlds of the Great Mother. This means that Dionysus rules the world of phenomena. In this case, his philosophy should be a phenomenological philosophy. We are dealing with the notion of "phenomenon" as from φαίνω, whose root can be traced back to the meanings "light" and "reality." The very same root is used to form ἀπόφασις ("concealment"), ἐπιφάνια ("revelation", "epiphany"), as well as λόγος αποφαντικός, which Aristotle employed to express the "declaratory expression", the fundamental element of his logic. Dionysus is also closely associated with the cycles of "phenomena" and concealments, the rhythms of changes which compose the structure of religious life and, accordingly, the paradigm of sacred time of his adepts. But the main point is that Aristotle's philosophy, which rethought Plato's doctrine of ideas, discarded it, and began to construct its theories on the basis of none other than the "phenomenon" located on the border between form and matter, between μορφή and ύλη. On one side, the phenomenon rises up the divine vertical of the *eidos* (εἶδος), but unlike the Platonic idea, the *eidos* here is conceptualized as being closely linked to its material foundation and not outside of it. Thus, we are dealing with a genuinely "intermediary philosophy" situated strictly between the Logos of Apollo and the Logos of Cybele, one which unfolds in

the zone now relinquished to the mythology (philo-mythia) of Dionysus, and which claims to have a completely autonomous structure capable of making judgements on what is higher and what is below it on the basis of its own criteria. Heidegger's great interest in a deep, fresh reading of Aristotle was most likely inspired by precisely this clear consciousness of the fact that besides Aristotle the Logician, beyond the creator of the first ontology (metaphysics) as is customary to qualify him in the theories of the Western European historical, there is another Aristotle: Aristotle the Phenomenologist. This Aristotle tries to overcome something similar to the initiatives of Husserl and Heidegger with regards to Plato – only not two and a half millennia after Plato, but immediately. We will attempt to illustrate this in greater detail in a separate chapter.

For now we can point out the close association between Aristotle and his royal student, Alexander the Great. According to the beliefs of devout Greeks, Alexander's father was Zeus himself, who laid with his mother Olympia, a priestess of the cult of Dionysus, in the form of a snake (as with Persephone, the mother of Zagreus) during the Bacchic orgies, as a result of which Alexander was venerated as the "New Dionysus." It cannot be ruled out that Alexander's march to India was the product of his own personal faith in this astonishing tale. It is no less surprising that such an initiative – extremely difficult and dangerous in military terms – was ultimately crowned with unprecedented success, as Alexander the Great, the New Dionysus, indeed succeeded in establishing a colossal Empire which united East and West into a single cultural and civilizational space.

Another, somewhat later model of Dionysian philosophy can be discerned in the Hermeticism of Late Antiquity, which represented its own kind of synthesis of fragments of Egyptian, Chaldean, Iranian, and Greek cultures with a whole number of ideas and models borrowed from Orphism and the arsenal of mysteries. Hermes, like Dionysus, was a god, but unlike many other gods was distinguished by an ontological mobility, polyformity, and the ability to rapidly and dynamically move throughout all levels of the world – from the heights of Olympus to the depths of Tartarus. The Greeks believed Hermes to be a psychopomp, the "driver of souls", the one who drove the dead into hell and the heroes up Olympus. The philosophy that was angled around Hermes' element was also distinct for its hybrid diversity, dynamism, and dialectical poly-semanticism characteristic of the middle world. Hermeticism can be seen as a shadow of Aristotelian logical phenomenology: here philo-mythia, paradigmatic qualities, the figures of the mystery cycle, and the mysterious metaphors of the planetary-mineral cycle are all employed more eagerly than the procedures of conscious reason which Aristotle and his followers would employ with such priority. The substantive difference in stylistics, however, should not hide from us the commonalities of the fundamental, paradigmatic approach of these two types of philosophizing: they belong to one and the same noological level, like two brigades of one and the same army, acting in solidarity over the course of Noomakhia. We can see this tendency towards synthesis on the part of the Hermetic spirit and Aristotelianism in the Stoa and later in the Middle Ages in Scholastic Aristotelianism (that of Albertus Magnus, Roger Bacon, and Thomas Aquinas) and in the shadow duplicated by the

alchemical treatises (whether correctly or not, nevertheless tellingly) attributed to the classics of rationalist scholasticism.

The Philosophy of the Castrates

What, then, will be the third philosophy corresponding to the Black Logos of Cybele? In the solar Platonic vision, we can obtain only an external, “celestial” view, which sees as its bottom the khora (Χώρα), the space of the subtle film of the chaotic movement of scattered particles not yet formed by the ordering demiurge. Χώρα comes from the same root as mythological “chaos”, χάος, meaning “yawning”, or literally “opening the jaws”, “freeing the empty space.” Instead of the voluminous “chaos” that creates the three-dimensionality of unordered void, Timaeus sees a film that resists comprehension by the classical Apollonian logos and whose comprehension demands falling into slumber, losing clarity and rigor, and degeneration.

Aristotle paid much more attention to “matter”, ύλη. The latter becomes a necessary component of being, without which, as without the “subject” (υποκείμενον), there can be no being (unlike Platonic ideas, which are that which is: το ὄν). Accordingly, matter acquires a certain positive ontological dimension that is fundamentally superior to its status in Platonism. The thing as phenomenon stands in the forefront of Aristotle’s system, and all of its traits are conceived as appendices to its actual presence, the essential role in which is played by matter. As follows, in the spirit of the Logos of Dionysus we have drawn substantially nearer to the zone of matter and the Mother. It is this particular, implicit materialism in Aristotle that was taken up by the Stoics who, combining this doctrine with those of the Pre-Socratics, constructed a developed model of rationalist materialism in which even the Logos is assigned the status of a material element. The early and late Stoa (with the exception of the middle, specifically Panaetius and Posidonius, who sought to combine Stoicism with Platonism, thereby departing from the main system of this philosophy) can be considered the borderline scenario of Aristotelian philosophy, in which the center of attention is shifted to matter as its lower limit. Yet still the form, the *eidos*, remains the fundamental pole of the phenomenon and, as follows, therefore cannot claim the role of being the philosophy of Cybele. Instead, the latter corresponds to a different philosophical tradition, one born in the Thracian city of Abdera and transmitted from Leucippus through Democritus to Epicurus and the Epicureans, up to the Roman philosopher Lucretius Carus. This constellation of thinkers stands closest of all to the structures of the Black Logos.

Democritus built his doctrines on the complete negation of the Apollonian vertical order, thus moving not from top to bottom (as the Platonists), but from bottom to top. Democritus’ philosophy was based on two notions: the minimally indivisible particle (the atom), and emptiness, or the “Great Void.” Such is

the pillar of being underlying all phenomena formed out of the interplay of atoms moving chaotically according to the laws of isonomy, i.e., in any possible direction and in any possible combination. The blind rampage of sputtered particles turns into vortices which constitute organizational ensembles, but order itself, including the *eidoi*, figures, bodies, and processes, is shaped by the aleatoric laws of random combinations.

Thus, Democritus argued that the gods are essentially a hallucinatory cluster of atoms and, as such, are not eternal, but are capable of appearing in dreams to inform a sleeping person of minor events or simply to frighten them. There is no harmony or immanent logic in the world, everything is utterly meaningless. Seeing the world as an insignificant accident, Democritus laughed at anyone who treated being seriously and solemnly, thus earning himself the epithet “the laughing philosopher.” Here we can see the typical depiction of the birth of Gaia as a grimacing, worm-like monster imitative of the human consciousness of a condensed phantom (εἶδωλον). The inhabitants of Abder considered Democritus to be insane. Democritus spent all of his free time – and all of his time was free, as he was a parasite living off of his inheritance – at the cemetery or in city garbage dumps. In the spirit of his general system, Democritus did not believe in eternity, the soul, or immortality, but solely in accident and the Great Void of the dead and alienated Universe.

Here we can see a vivid example of the mystical nocturne, the shift of consciousness towards the opposite side, towards identification with the blind, unseen, or ghostly forces of matter, disorder, and chaos, i.e., the philosophy of Night. Plato was completely right to see in Democritus and his atomists existential enemies, the bearers of the chthonic, titanic element. It is telling that Plotinus directly compared the atomists to the castrated priests of the Great Mother (the Galli) and emphasized that the eunuch is the only truly sterile: while woman can serve as the habitat of the ripening of a fetus, the castrate embodies ultimate vanity and absolute impotence.

Similar ideas were developed in Epicurus’ philosophy, which reduced all of reality to the sensual world and recognized the doctrine of atoms, thereby rejecting not only the being of Platonic ideas, but also the forms/*eidoi* of Aristotle. For Epicurus, who believed in many worlds, the gods are like perfect cohesions of atoms in complete isolation from people (between worlds) which have no influence on anything. Epicurus believed happiness to be complete indifference (ἀταραξία). Insofar as the gods are happy, they must be indifferent towards everything and, as follows, they do not participate in the life of the universe, nor the being of peoples, and therefore their presence, completely unmanifest, is essentially identical to their absence – hence the notion of *deus otiosus*, or the “lazy, idle god” attested in different religious and mythological systems. People are usually inclined to quickly forget such gods.

In this case, man's soul is as mortal as his body. Epicurus believed in the evolution of species, postulating that material forces develop from the simplest forms towards the emergence of more organized beings. Moreover, Epicurus considered the goal of life to be pleasure. A full exposition of Epicurean views was presented in the poem of Lucretius Carus, who synthesized the philosophical aspects of the Black Logos with a number of chthonic myths concerned with the origins of people, the less perfect yields of the Earth which preceded them, and the forms which have not yet evolved within the span of the animal and plant world known to us.

In Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius Carus, we have a developed panorama of the philosophy of the Titans which shaped the Logos of the Great Mother and systematized its procedures and basic concepts. This is the intellectual headquarters of the Titanomachy active on the philosophical, religious, and cultural levels. This is one of the three main poles of the war of the minds, the Noomakhia. In this army of thinkers of the mystical nocturne, we can also see that this is not even what Gaia herself thinks, but rather the products of her parthenogenetic self-fertilization, products of her creation, mobilized into her army, generated by privation, poverty, and deficiency, i.e., the basic qualities of the material element.

The Neoplatonists saw the castrate philosophy of materialism to be a gross violation of healthy sense and related its main principles to the final four hypotheses of Plato's Parmenides pertaining to the denial of the existence of the One. Thus, we are dealing here with a philosophy of the universe which, from an Apollonian point of view, simply cannot exist – cannot and should not.

The Relevance of the Three Philosophies

Having examined the vertical, synchronic view of the philosophical schools of classical Greece, we have divided such into three types and poles corresponding to the Three Logoi. The main figures of these three headquarters of Noomakhia are represented by Plato (and the Platonists), Aristotle, and Democritus (and Epicurus).

Platonists stand for the verticle when it exists, and they struggle for its restoration when it has been shaken. Their philosophy can change its superstructure depending on the state of the world in which the Platonist finds himself, and depending on the nature of the philosophical season. If Apollo, Zeus, and the Olympian gods hold firmly to power over the city, the people, the country, and the civilization, then Platonists act as conservatives. If Platonists are put in the context of the shifty, flickering, dramatic Logos of Dionysus or Hermes, they will be inclined towards restoration, towards raising Dionysus and preventing him from descending again. Finally, under the reality of hell, under the control of the Black

Logos of the Great Mother, Platonists will fulfill the role of radical revolutionaries, philosophical extremists who challenge the suggestive magic of material lies.

Aristotelians, meanwhile, can theoretically harmoniously exist in idealist systems or accept certain positions of materialism. The Stoa demonstrates to us the limits of what is achievable.

Finally, the sensualist atomists will play the role of revolutionary nihilists in a Platonic order, and they will gravitate towards materialist interpretations of intermediary "Dionysian" systems (emphasizing the similarities between Dionysus and Hades in Heraclitus in accordance with the logic of "he went down to hell and staid there"). In the zone of chthonic culture, on the contrary, they will find themselves with the status of apologists, defenders, and guardians of the order of things.

The general system of the culture of classical Greece was built on the implicit recognition of the Olympian element and, accordingly, Apollonian philosophy (including Platonism, the Eleatics, the Pythagoreans, etc.). However, even then this trend, beyond its conservative features, bore restorationist and even partially revolutionary elements, such as in the political ideas of the Pythagorean union or the reforms which Plato proposed to the tyrant of Syracuse, Dionysus (as well as his son). To a considerable extent, they represented vanguard revolutionary projects aimed at returning full power to the solar gods who had somewhat drifted towards more mundane and less perfect powers.

After Aristotle, philosophy came to be dominated by the Stoics with their phenomenological approach and significant share of materiality (insofar as matter was considered to be the vital substance of "pneuma" and even the Logos itself). The Stoics were the first to clearly articulate the philosophy of the Empire of Alexander and then of Rome. Although atomism and Epicureanism were never dominant tendencies in classical Greece, they developed freely and drew a significant number of nocturnal minds in search of pleasure to the "philosophy of the garden."

The Middle Ages saw Aristotelianism prevail, with both Platonism and materialism, sensualism, and atomism displaced to the periphery. In this sense, the debate on universals in Catholic Scholasticism reflected the essential sense of the Medieval balance of forces of Noomakhia: Aristotelian Thomism/Realism prevailed over the Idealism/Platonism of Scotus Erigena on the one hand and the Nominalism/Materialism of the Franciscans (Johannes Roscelin and William of Ockham) on the other.

Modernity was distinguished by the gradual rise of the Logos of Cybele. Galileo and Gassendi revived atomism, and nominalism became the basis of the scientific method. Materialism thus gradually became the criterion of scientificity. Eternity was rejected and replaced by the absolutization of time, historicism and, finally, the idea of progress. As in Epicurus' philosophy, god first becomes "idle" (Deism) and "logical" (the "god of the philosophers"), and then yields to pure atheism (Nietzsche's "God is dead"). The human soul is thought to be mortal and then comes to be regarded as the "psyche", that is the sublimated continuation of the physical organism. The doctrine of the atomic structure of matter came to be laid at the foundation of the physical map of the world of Modernity, and the opening of this vacuum brings us back to the Great Void of Democritus. Space becomes isotropic and Democritus' principle of isonymy thereby becomes dogma.

Modernity, thus, is the onset of the philosophical winter, marked by the domination of the Great Mother of Matter. The Titans storm the abode of the gods. Night triumphs over day. The mystical nocturne subjugates the ranks of the heroic diurne. Thus arises the era of the masses, of gravity (Isaac Newton's universal gravitation) and – in René Guénon words – the "reign of quantity." In the context of Noomakhia, this is the shift of the center of attention from the paradisaal mountain to hell's funnel, from the peak and the top to the bottom of the cosmic well. In such a situation, Platonism and its echoes, i.e., the remnants of the army of the gods, the partisans of Olympus, go underground, into the realm of peripheral mysticism, of "secret societies", "Conservative Revolutionaries", and "conspirators conspiring to restore the Golden Age." In the 20th century, their programmatic manifesto was articulated in René Guénon's books, first and foremost *The Crisis of the Modern World* and *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times* (as well as other of Guénon's works) [9], and Julius Evola's *Revolt Against the Modern World*, *The Mystery of the Grail*, and *Ride the Tiger* (as well as the rest of Evola's oeuvre) [10].

We find the Dionysian Logos in Modernity in Hermeticism and European Romanticism, such as in Schelling's Dionysiology or Hölderlin's Christian Dionysianism, as well as in the many mystical circles and secret organizations which became closely interconnected in the circumstances of existence within a common underground in the face of the domination of a common enemy – the Titans. In the 20th century, this was most clearly manifested in such a phenomenon as "soft Traditionalism" (Mark Sedgwick's term), which seeks not so much to oppose as to reconcile earthly reality with the heavenly Logos. A paradigmatic prototype of this approach can be said to be represented by the group of thinkers associated in one way or another with the Eranos seminars formed around Carl Jung, Mircea Eliade, Louis Massignon, Henry Corbin, Gershom Scholem, T. Suzuki, Karl Kerényi, and later Gilbert Durand and others. Russian religious philosophy, and primarily Sophiology, belongs to this type. In European philosophy, this current includes phenomenology, and especially Martin Heidegger. Nietzsche's call to appeal to the figure of Dionysus was thus heard by representatives of different currents in philosophy.

Under the dictatorship of the Titans, the Logos of Apollo and the more flexible and subtle Logos of Dionysus (the Dark Logos) find themselves in a subordinate position. The main blows are dealt to direct opponents, such as Platonists, but also to representatives of the Dionysian element which, having a natural share in the Divine, are also subjected to the aggression of the sons of Earth. After all, Dionysus-Zagreus was dismembered by the Titans, and they continue to tear him apart to this day.

The synchronism and cyclical diachronism of this noological map and calendar thus allow us to discern Tradition and Modernity both as coexisting spatial zones of ontology and as successive, agonal types of domination of one or another paradigm. In the Noomachy, there are starting positions, base areas, and theaters of military operations where control over one or another height changes hands over the course of dramatic and dynamic battles. Insofar as, according to Plato, "time is the image of eternity", time consists of both eternity's likeness and its unlikeness. The latter consists of the diachronicity of the order of the unfolding of the philosophical seasons, of the concrete dynamics of military operations, and of the shifts in the episodes of Titanomachy (as well as the Gigantomachy and, more generally, the Noomachy). Eternity's likeness is at its maximum at the height of Olympus, where time merges with eternity, and is at its minimal at the Great Midnight, where there is only time. This point of the Great Midnight is the culmination of Noomakhia, the moment of the Endkampf, Ragnarök, the final battle, the place and time of the Decision (Entscheidung). It is here, in the zone furthest removed from the kingdom of Zeus, in the period of the abandonment by Being (Seinsverlassenheit), during the Night of the Gods (Gottesnacht), when the gods have fled (der Flucht der Götter) and when Olympus, according to the final Oracle, has fallen, that the final mystery of Dionysus is revealed – the mystery of the only god capable of penetrating to the very bottom of hell. Heidegger spoke of the Untergehende, the one who descends into hell without being hell himself, who enters into time and is torn by it but remains, in essence, a drop of eternity. This is the heart of Dionysus saved by Athena – it is all that is left in the wake of the successful realization of the diabolical plan of the Titans.

Time prevails over eternity completely, purging it, becoming only its unlikeness, its simulacrum, a copy without an original – but only for a moment. It ceases to last once it loses its resemblance to eternity whose image it is. Of course, time denies this and tries to portray its privative being as self-sufficient. Such is the essence of the uprising of the Earth and its monsters against the dwellers of the Sky, of Heaven. The semantics of the End Times and the battle for the End Times, i.e., the battle for the "end of time", is constituted by this proportion between autonomy and dependency.

And here it is time to remember Dionysus' name: "The Midnight Sun." Such is a paradox, for Night is Night because there is no sun. But where is the sun at night? Where are warmth and life during the season of philosophical winter? Where is the sky when Earth wins? Where do the gods flee? This is the question of Dionysus, his concealment, his epiphany, his essence, and his heart. This is the main question of Noomakhia.

Footnotes:

[1] Alexander Dugin, *In Search of the Dark Logos: Philosophico-Theological Outlines* (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2012).

[2] Gilbert Durand, *Les Structures anthropologiques de l'imaginaire* (Paris: Borda, 1969).

[3] Alexander Dugin, *Sotsiologiya voobrazheniya. Vvedenie v strukturnuyu sotsiologiyu* (Moscow: Akademicheskii Proekt, 2010).

[4] Alexander Dugin, "Noch' i ee luchi", in *Radikalnyi Sub'ekt i ego dubl'* (Moscow: Eurasian Movement, 2009).

[5] Plato, *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated by B. Jowett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1892). Russian edition: Platon, "Sofist" in *Fedon, Pir, Fedr, Parmenid* (Moscow: Mysl', 1999).

[6] Vicente Ferreira Da Silva, *Transcendencia do mundo* (Sao Paulo: E Realizacoes, 2010).

[7] According to legend, Plato's tomb in the Academy bore the inscription: "Apollo begat two sons, Asclepius and Plato, the one to save the body and the other the soul."

[8] See: Alexander Dugin, Martin Heidegger: *Vozmozhnost' russkoi filosofii* (Moscow: Academic Project, 2011).

[9] See: René Guénon, *The Crisis of the Modern World*; Ibidem, *The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times*.

[10] See: Julius Evola, *Revolt Against the Modern World*; Ibidem, *The Mystery of the Grail*; Ibidem, *Ride the Tiger*.

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 2 of *Noomakhia – The Three Logoi: Apollo, Dionysus, and Cybele* (Moscow: Academic Project, 2014)

Thinking Chaos and the “Other Beginning” of Philosophy

August 21, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Yulian Orlov

From Platonizm.ru

Chaos was not part of the context of Greek philosophy. Greek philosophy was built exclusively as a philosophy of the Logos, and to us such a state of affairs is so normal, that we (probably correctly from a historical point of view) identify philosophy with the Logos. We do not know any other philosophy, and, in principle, if we are to believe Friedrich Nietzsche and Martin Heidegger along with contemporary postmodernist philosophy, we will have to acknowledge that the very philosophy which was discovered by the Greeks and built up around the Logos has today fully exhausted its contents. It incarnated itself in techne, in the subject-object topography that turned out to be evidentiary for only two or three centuries until the final, sunset note of West-European philosophy. As a matter of fact, today we are standing on the line or endpoint of this philosophy of the Logos.

Today, we can glimpse the entire process of the evolution of logocentric philosophy that began with Heraclitus and the Pre-Socratics, reached its apogee in Platonism and Socrates, was developed fairly violently in Greco-Latin patristics and later in Scholasticism and the Neoplatonic Renaissance and, in the New Era, turned together with Descartes through the subject-object topography onto its last- self-reflective stage that, in turn, ended with Nietzsche. According to Heidegger, it was precisely Nietzsche who ended West-European philosophy. Thus, we have before us a finished story with a beginning, climax, and end, all about logocentric culture. The Logos, from cradle to grave. But then we have to ask ourselves: who was Heidegger?

On the one hand, Heidegger definitely ends this process of Western philosophy and puts down the final seal, but on the other hand he (potentially) lays the foundations of something new. The end of philosophy is absolutely clear, but the question about the “other Beginning” (der andere Anfang) remains open.

It is totally clear that West-European philosophy, being logocentric, has exhausted its potential. However, we have to ask ourselves the question: what role did chaos play in this logocentric philosophy? It was rejected from the very beginning, left out of account, crossed out, because the Logos is based on the exclusion of chaos, on the affirmation of there being a hard alternative to it. What is the fundamental difference between logos and chaos? The Logos is exclusivity, the Logos is separation, the Logos is a clear idea about the one and the other; it is not by random chance that the Logos received its formalised form in the logic of Aristotle, in its fundamental laws: the law of identity, the law of negation and the law of the excluded third. It is necessary to emphasise that modern and post-modern studies entirely correctly show, that the logocentric understanding of the world is masculinoid, i.e. exclusively male, exclusivist [1]. It is this way, in an explosive manner, that men think of the world and order. The Logos is a male, hierarchised beginning that was simplified in West-European philosophy, reached its high point, and... collapsed, was cast down, dissipated. Today, the "great man", the "cosmic man" has been shattered into fragments. He collapsed, and together with him his philosophy crumbled, as the Logos and the male beginning are, as a matter of fact, the very same thing. This is where the rightness of the postmodernist, critical term "phallo-logocentrism" comes from. The entire West-European philosophy was built on the male principle from beginning to end. This end is here. We are living through it. This means that the Logos is exhausted. Therefore, we must either meekly slip into the night, or search for new paths.

If we review this process of the appearance, establishment, and downfall of Western European philosophy and the appearance of the Logos in a pure form, consequently, as demasculinisation continues (according to Plato, only the philosopher is a true man; in other words, a man is he who philosophises; therefore, today we can speak of a sweeping degeneration and spiritual castration of men, as they are no longer capable of engaging in philosophy) and the Logos falls, we see before us an image of mixing: dissipated fragments of male logical thought are turbulently mixing amongst each other, thereby forming a post-masculinist amalgamate. It is precisely to this mixing, this phenomenon of the turbulence of parts that are no longer part of something whole that is indicated by those who use the concept of "chaos" in modern science.

Here, we must immediately say that the chaos with which modern science, modern physics, and chaos theory operate is actually a set of structures of order that is more complex. This is nothing else than complex systems that are not at all alternatives to order as such, but are just an extravagant, baroque (here, too, the ideas of postmodernist G. Deleuze from his essay "The Fold: Leibnitz and the Baroque" are valuable) version of a complexified, twisted and significantly perverted order. That was is today called "chaos" by representatives of the scientific and, in part, the cultural establishment is the condition of the post-logical world, a world that is still located, however, within the Logos, inside its orbit, albeit at the most distant periphery, at its last border. A very precise name for such a state of affairs has been given by René Guénon, who called this situation "la confusion" (Fr. "mixing", "tangle", "everything getting caught in everything else").

The concept of “chaos” that is dominant in modern science does not correspond at all to the Greek chaos as something primordial, organic, and spontaneous, but as the product of the collapse of logocentric philosophy and the logocentric culture that was based on it. The fact that we are today dealing with an alleged “chaos” actually refers to the product of the Logos’s collapse and separation into different fragments. It is precisely for this reason that scholars of “chaos” find within it residual or extravagant, eccentric structures of the Logos. These can be studied and quantified only in more complex procedures and with the help of a special device that has been adapted for the quantifying and description of bifurcational processes, non-integrated equations (I. Prigozhin), and fractals (B. Mandelbrot). The theory of “chaos” studies process that are exceptionally dependent on initial conditions. The definition of “chaos” in modern science is today taken to be the following: a dynamic system with the following traits: sensitivity to initial conditions, topological mixing, and the density of periodical orbits. Mathematicians further specify, that a “chaotic system should have non-linear characteristics and be globally stable, but also have at least one unstable point of equilibrium of oscillating type; in addition, the dimensions of the system should be no less than 1,5 (i.e. the order of a differential equation should be no less than 3)” [3].

Actually, it is not the Greek chaos at all that is hinted at in this concept of “chaos”, but a product of the dispersion and disintegration of the Logos. This is so because we have not yet left the bounds of the Logos: the chaos that modern science deals with is integrated into the Logos, it splashes around within its inner space (albeit at the most extreme orbit), as far away as possible from the logocentric axis, in the furthest borderland of the conceptual Platonic cosmos, in the world of the Titans [4]. Therefore, we must, strictly speaking, call this reality a “very remote copy” that has nearly lost its link to the original; we must not in any case, however, call it “chaos”. Here, either the term “mixing” (Guénon’s “la confusion”) is most appropriate or the postmodern concept of the “simulacrum”, which J. Baudrillard interprets as a “copy without an original”. This is an intralogical zone (albeit at a maximum distance from the centre) that has nothing in common with the initial image of Greek chaos, which, according to myth, precedes the Logos, precedes order, i.e. the cosmos. True chaos is pre-cosmic, pre-ontological. The “mixing” or “chaos” of modern science is post-cosmic, and although almost nothing of being remains within it, it still is, which means that it is in some sense ontological. Here, Zeno’s aporia on the quick Achilles and the turtle is entirely relevant. No matter how much the “mixing” might try to run from ontology, it is analytically incapable of doing so; as René Guénon shows, a line x moving towards 0 will never be equal to 0, but will only continually approach 0 while always remaining at an ever diminishing but still infinitely great (although it is infinitely small) distance from it.

While researching “chaos” (the philosophical Gilles Deleuze describes this as a way of coexistence for incompatible monads [6]; Deleuze himself calls such “monads” “nomads”), modern science is

researching the intra-logos, post-logos, dissipative order, instead of an alternative to order, as the nihilistically minded postmodernists had hoped.

Here, it is important to pay attention to the concept of “nothing”. The Logos draws everything into itself and accords to everything the quality of self-identification with itself, i.e. with the Logos. The Logos is everything and draws everything into itself, with the exception of that which it is not; but that which it is not is nothing, the Logos excludes everything that it does not include, and, as it includes everything, only nothing remains outside of it. However, it interacts harshly with this nothing: according to Parmenides, there is no non-being. Nothing surrounds order and serves as a boundary. As we are looking at nothing through the eyes of the Logos, however, it becomes clear that we cannot reach that boundary. However hard we might strive to words nothing, whatever nihilism we might cultivate, we keep remaining in the limits of something and not nothing, inside of order, under the hegemony of the Logos. And even though this hegemony weakens at its extreme limit, it never entirely disappears. Therefore, on the road towards liberation from the power and domination, the modernists (and the postmodernists after them) find the figure of the “despot” in God and traditional society, in society as such, later in reason, even later in man himself, structures, language, context (poststructuralism) etc. The condition that there is no non-being makes being unbearable for those who consider its weight to be a hindrance. All evocations of “chaos” or calls to “nomadic”, incompatible monads that are incapable of providing the desired result, i.e. the final and irreversible uprooting of the “will to power”, which is the main aim of the liberating program of the Enlightenment cannot and will not succeed by its very definition.

Those who understand the situation of the deep crisis of Modernity (in particular Martin Heidegger) turn to the roots of the West, to the Greek matrix that birthed philosophy. Heidegger meticulously studies the birth of the Logos and tracks its faith, all the way up to the rule of technics, *Machenschaft*. In order to describe it, he introduces the concept of “*Gestell*”, in which the referential theory of truth itself is summed up, from Plato (and even from Heraclitus) up to the mechanical mercantile-materialistic civilisation of modern, utmost planetary (but continuously Western-centric) decadence. Having examined the history of philosophy (which also is history as such) from beginning to end, Heidegger finds that it ended so wrongly precisely because it begun so incorrectly. As an alternative, he proposes the project of the “other Beginning” [7].

Having described the first Beginning of philosophy, which led to the logos and, finally, to that dissipative postlogos (and post-masculine) ontological regime that we find ourselves in, Heidegger identifies it as the consequence of a fundamental error that was made in the first, even preparatory stages of the development of West-European philosophy. According to his views, the history of Western European philosophy, culture, and religion is the result of a small, primordial fault in our metaphysical contemplation. According to Heidegger, two-and-a-half thousand years of human history were in vain, seeing as at the very beginning, somewhere in the area of the first formulations of the Logos’ status, a

certain error was accidentally allowed to sneak in, an error that, as Heidegger puts it, must first be acknowledged and then be overcome. Thus develops his idea of the two Beginnings of philosophy: the first Beginning, which began, formed, developed, flourished, and eventually degraded and has now become nothing (let us at least remember the modern nihilism that was discovered by F. Nietzsche and magnificently examined by Heidegger), and the other Beginning, which could be found as far back as the roots of philosophy (but this did not happen, and we can see the result: the Logos and its defeat), but, in any case, it should be delineated and initiated now, while everything is clear. But this beginning will begin only when everything truly becomes clear. Everything became clear to Heidegger. The rest is experiencing a “delay”, everything is “still not clear”, noch nicht[8], the eternal “still not”. The other Beginning — der andere Anfang.

If we examine in detail what Heidegger means by the “other Beginning” (the alternative, potential Beginning that has not yet formed or come to pass), and if we trace the line of the grandiose deconstruction of the Logos that he has undertaken, we will be able to view the entirety of West-European philosophy, culture, and history, including religious history; after all, religion is nothing other than the development of constructions of the Logos (which is why Heidegger speaks of “theologica”: the Christian faith, as well as the Muslim kalam and theological Judaism are founded upon the Logos, and, in principle, we know of no other monotheistic religions but for those religions of the Logos). The logocentrism of religions is a very important thing to understand: it shows, that it is futile to turn to religion when searching for an alternative or protection from the downfall of the Logos. The crisis of modern religions is the crisis of the Logos; when the Logos collapses, its entire vertical structure and all its variations (including theological ones) fall with it. This is interrelated: monotheism loses its fascinateness as the attraction of the Logos weakens, and vice versa. Religions without the Logos cease to be themselves. But even in the case where the Logos is present within them, it will be as a phantom pain, a “confusion”, as the vanity of desemantised structures (which is what we are seeing today in the form of the dubious phenomenon of a “religious renaissance”, which unambiguously smacks of a simulacrum and a parody).

For this reason, Heidegger proposed to look for an exit in a completely different way: in the sources of Greek philosophy, in the very Beginning (even in the vestibule of this Beginning) on the one hand, and beyond the boundaries of our world on the other, thereby uniting the problem of the moment of philosophy’s birth, its existence in an embryonic, intrauterine state with the problem of the moment of final agony and death. Before Heraclitus, philosophy was located in the uterus, the Logos “swam” in amniotic fluid, in a matrix: today, the Logos is buried in its grave. The grave and the womb have, on the one hand, the meaning of an antithesis: the first signifies death, the second birth; however, at the same time we know, that in the collective unconscious they are synonyms, mutual systems. One can figuratively say, that in both cases it is a night, darkness, existence without distinction, erasure of borders, nocturne [9], all the more so because many initiatic rituals are linked to a descent into the grave as well as the beginning of resurrection, i.e. another, second birth. This is also the rite of Orthodox

baptism: water symbolises the earth, the grave, death. The total, three-time immersion of the baptised into the baptistery is a symbol of the three days Christ spent in the grave. It is a descent into the earth, into the grave: the “burial of Christ” is a prerequisite for a new birth.

Thus, if the Logos was born in the first Beginning of Greek philosophy through the rejection of Chaos as an exclusive, central principle of division, hierarchy, exception, and order; that is to say, the male beginning was essentially raised to the level of the absolute; and if all of this began the way it did, and if everything ended with what we have in the modern world, then, accordingly, we must follow Heidegger in finding what was lost, what the mistake of that first impetus, which started the development of a logocentric civilisation, was. Heidegger develops his vision in recapitulative and exceptionally complex book “Beitrage zur Philosophie” [10], which I recommend all readers to familiarise themselves with (the work has not been translated, and I would say that this is excellent; it cannot be translated, and there are things that are not just difficult to translate, but which are criminal to translate, things that require the original language to be learned to be understood). The book directly deals with the “other Beginning”; contrariwise, we find a short and relatively “light” treatment of these ideas in the “Geschichte des Seyns” [11].

Heidegger proposes us to think in a radically different way from the one that is usual in philosophical or philosophical-religious thought. But how is it possible to philosophise differently, how can there be a “different Beginning” of philosophy? If we take a close, detailed look at the moment of the birth of Greek philosophy, we will find a single, essential element: philosophy is born alongside exclusion; what is more, it is Chaos that is the first victim of exclusion. Chaos is not a philosophical concept and never was one, but it enters philosophy exclusively through its intermediary, through its substitute in the person of the choir (cora), Platonic “space” in the “Timaeus”, or later in the person of Aristotle’s “matter” (ulh). However, the view of the choir in the “Timaeus” and the view of Aristotle’s matter is the view of the Logos [12], and all the Logos says it that it has already excluded Chaos during the process of its ascension in a similar fashion to “political propaganda” or a “press release”. What the Logos tells us about matter is an exclusively constructivist Wille zur Macht, the “will to power”, a development of an impassioned and aggressive strategy of male domination, the establishment of hierarchic hegemony, the projection of wishful thinking and self-fulfilling prophecy. From the very beginning of philosophy, the “dog was wagged”. Philosophy tries to force unto us that, which is favourable to itself. This is the hiding place of male cunning, the male drive to the absolutisation of the self, and, accordingly, the exclusion of the female beginning, the “other” beginning. And, if we examine this, we can recognise the total incomprehension of the woman. This is the source of woman being accorded qualities that, in reality, she does not have at all. Thus, the male forms between itself that which is excluded by the male from the intellectual process. The Logos rejects the choir because of its (un)intelligibility. However, it does not understand it purely because it does not want to understand and prefers to deal with a representation instead of the female itself. The man thinks, that the only way of knowing the woman is to hide her in inner rooms, separate her from the public, social dimension. Later, he thinks a suitable solution is to

chase the female away entirely, etching way her traces through the suffering of lonely male asceticism. Therefore, the opinion of the Logos about chaos is a notorious lie, violence, hegemony, the exclusion of chaos as the other. As the Logos is everything, chaos becomes nothing [13].

If we want to comprehend the very possibility of an “other Beginning” of philosophy, on the one hand, we must come to the moment of the birth of the Logos and fix this transition of the boundary, discern the details and semantics of this rite du passage. How could it have come to pass that the Logos managed to break loose, unbind itself, and who allowed it to issue its own, exclusive decrees concerning chaos? Now we come to the most interesting: if we feel discontent with the dissipative logical and postlogical structures, we must acknowledge, that we must turn to the Logos again, seeing as it was the Logos that created all the prerequisites of its dissipation through its exclusivity. We cannot simply up and return to Platonism: there is no way back. The Logos moves only in one direction: it divides and divides (and divides and divides... and so on into the distance [14]). Gilbert Durand [15] call this logic the regime of the “diurn”: until everything is reduced to a chit and stops. This schizomorphosis [16] directly leads to G. Deleuze and F. Guattari’s concept of “schizomass” [17]. This has been beautifully illustrated in the films of Takeshi Miike, for example, in “Killer Ichi” or “Izo”. In the latter film, an insane samurai, having begun his battle with the world, does not stop until he has cut everyone he encounters into pieces. Izo is the Logos.

The Logos will not help us. If we do not like how the modern, postlogical world is organised, we are forced (if we like it or not) to turn to chaos. We have no other alternative: we must fundamentally step backward towards the first Beginning of Greek culture, in order to make even the smallest step forward, truly forward, and not following the endless arc of the eternally ending world, that is still not capable of finally ending (“still not”). If we do not do this, we will reach the eternal deadlock of the infinite return of dissipative structures and confusions. This is the choice we must make: either we choose the modern, postlogical chaos of confusions, or we break through its boundaries; but the way to break through its boundaries can be found only in chaos, which itself precedes the Logos and is located radically beyond its borders, behind the line of its peripheral agony.

Chaos can and should be seen as an inclusive order, as an order founded upon a principle that is opposite to the Logos; that is to say, the principle of inclusivity, inclusiveness. Therefore, it is very important to understand what inclusiveness means. Once we have comprehended this term, we will know if it is at all possible to build a philosophy of chaos, that is, a philosophy of the “other Beginning”.

If we see chaos the way it is seen by logocentric models, we will get nowhere. There is nothing logical (exclusive, masculine, no *Wille zur Macht*) in chaos, and this means, that it becomes *ouk on* (Greek:

“pure non-being”), French “rien”, Spanish “nada” to the Logos and Onto-Logos. – ouk on and not mhon, as the Greeks called the non-being that is capable of producing something from itself, “pregnant non-being”). As the Logos will not see anything except itself, according to the principle of Aristotelian logic, we cannot juxtapose anything to it: either A is equal to A (and, in this case, we find ourselves within logical boundaries) or A is not equal to A; now we are outside of those borders, in nothing. According to Aristotle, the latter situation means that A simply does not exist; the A that was not equal to A does not exist. This is in contrast to, for example, the view of the Japanese philosopher Kitaro Nishida, who has, in contrast to Aristotle, developed a separate logic of spaces, “basho”, founded upon Zen Buddhist models of thought.

However, outside of the Logos and its hypnotic suggestion, it is entirely possible to conceptualise chaos as a principle of absolute inclusion or an inclusive philosophy. Why is this possible? Because, if we extract ourselves from the political propaganda of the Logos (under the conditions of which we have been living for two and a half thousand years), we will be able to see chaos as it presents itself, and not the way the Logos presents it. Chaos reveals itself as the inclusive, it carries within itself all possibilities, including the possibility of exclusion, right up to the exclusion of the self. Naturally, chaos contains the Logos as it thinks itself, like a seed in a woman’s uterus: it is and it is being born, it will most definitely be born, tear away, mature, and leave: however, something more important is left out of the picture: that which allows it to live, that which produces, nurtures, and feeds it.

The Logos can be seen as a fish swimming in the waters of chaos. Without this water, thrown onto the surface, the fish chokes, and this is, actually, how the structures of the Logos “croaked”. We are dealing with nothing but its dissipative remains. These are the bones of the fish that has hurled itself onto the shore. It is not by chance, that many speak of the symbolism of Aquarius as the new water, without which the old fish could not live.

The philosophy of chaos is possible because chaos, being all-inclusive, all-encompassing, and the antecedent of any exclusion, contains this very exclusion within itself, but carries a different relation to it and itself, as well as differing from the way exclusion itself (i.e. the Logos) relates to chaos and itself. We know only one view of chaos: the philosophical view from the position of the Logos, and if we want to look at the Logos from the point of view of chaos, we are told that this is impossible, seeing as we are used to examining chaos only from the point of view of the Logos. It is thought, that only the Logos is capable of seeing, and that chaos is blind. No, this is not true, chaos has a thousand eyes, it is “panoptic”. Chaos sees itself as that which contains the Logos, which means that the Logos is located within chaos and can always be within it. However, while containing the Logos within itself, chaos contains it in a totally different way the Logos contains itself, which it does by rejecting the fact that it is contained by anything (whatever that container may be) except itself, and, accordingly, placing chaos out of its view, equating it to nothing, rejecting it. Thus, the fish, recognising itself as something

different from the water surrounding it, can come to the conclusion that it no longer needs the water and jumps onto the shore. However one might try to throw the stupid fish back, it will try to jump time and time again. They called this insane fish "Aristotle".

But water is the beginning of everything. It contains the root of other elements and other creatures. It contains that which it is and that which it is not. It includes that which acknowledges the abovementioned fact, but also that which does not.

We can draw the following conclusion: first, a philosophy of Chaos is possible, and second, salvation through the Logos is impossible: the salvation of the Logos is only possible through a correct turn towards chaos.

Chaos is not just "old", it is always "new", because eternity is always new: the eternity (l'éternité) that Rimbaud found again (a retrouvé) – c'est la mer allée avec le soleil. Pay attention: la mer. Chaos is the newest, the freshest, the most fashionable, the latest from the current season's collection (Il faut être absolument moderne. Point de cantiques : tenir le pas gagné) (1). Precisely for the reason that it is absolutely eternal: time ages extremely quickly, yesterday appears archaic (there is nothing more ancient than the "news" of a month old newspaper), only eternity is always absolutely new. Therefore, the discovery of chaos does not equate to an excavation of history or of the structures that are presented to us as conquered by historical time; no, it is an encounter with the eternally young. Chaos was not sometime earlier or before. Chaos is here and now. Chaos is not that what was, as the Logos propagandises. Chaos is that what is, and that what will be.

In conclusion, we return once more to Heidegger. To reach the truth of being (Wahrheit des Seyns) is possible only in two moments of history: in the Beginning, when philosophy is about to be born, and in the End, when the disappearance, the liquidation of philosophy takes place. Of course, individual personalities could reach the truth in different stages as well; however, they could do this, but they could also be satisfied with something else: they lived in the magic of the Logos, warming themselves in the rays of the solar seed.

Today, this is the only thing we have left, all the rest has been bled dry, and to satisfy ourselves with dissolution in an endlessly ending but incapable of truly ending world, in the "not yet" is the fate of nonentities. Apart from this, doing this in our time is easier than it ever was before. You and I, dear reader, are living in extraordinary times, in which we are presented with an entirely unexpected

opportunity to directly encounter chaos. This is not an experience for the weak minded. After all, our task is the construction of a philosophy of chaos.

Footnotes:

[1] See the problem of the “diurn” in the topography of G. Durand’s imaginative structures. Dugin A. G. Sociology of the Imagination. Moscow: Akademicheskyy Proekt, 2010.

[2] Deleuze, G. The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque. Moscow: Izdatelstvo Logos, 1997.

[3] Gutzwiller Martin. Chaos in Classical and Quantum Mechanics. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1990.

[4] See Proclus. Commentaire sur le Timee. Par A.J.Festugiere. t. I. P.:Vrin, 1966.

[5] Guenon René. Les principes du calcul infinitésimal. Paris, Gallimard, 1946.

[6] Deleuze, G. The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque.

[7] Dugin A. Martin Heidegger. The Philosophy of Another Beginning. Moscow: Akademicheskyy Proekt, 2010.

[8] Heidegger M. Sein und Zeit. Erstes Kapitel §§ 46–53. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1952.

[9] Dugin A. G. Sociology of the Imagination.

[10] Heidegger M. Beiträge zur Philosophie. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 2003.

[11] Heidegger M. Geschichte des Seyns. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1998

[12] Dugin A. Martin Heidegger. The Possibility of Russian Philosophy. Moscow: Akademichesky Proekt, 2011.

[13] Ibidem.

[14] On “diarhysis” and the structure of the “diurn”, which are distinct features of the Logos’ work, see Dugin A. Sociology of the Imagination..

[15] Durand G. Les Structures anthropologiques de l’imaginaire, Paris: P.U.F., 1960.

[16] Ibidem.

[17] Deleuze, G., Guattari F. Anti-Oedipus. Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Yekaterinburg: U-Faktoriya, 2007.

Translator’s note:

(1): One must be absolutely modern. Never mind hymns of thanksgiving: hold on to a step once taken.

TOWARDS LAOCRACY

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

TOWARDS LAOCRACY

Under capitalism, the capitalists rule. Under socialism - representatives of the working class, the proletariat. Under Nazism and Fascism - racial or national elite, "the new aristocracy". Under Fourth Political Theory should rule the People (Narod in Russian, akin to the German Volk: not "Population").

Modern Russia - has capitalism. Hence, it is ruled by capitalists. Therefore not Narod. In order to build Russia, in which will rule the Narod, it is necessary to carry out an anti-capitalist (anti-oligarchic, at least) Revolution. Financial magnates should be excluded from political power. And that's the main thing. Everyone should choose - power OR wealth. Choose wealth, forget about power. Choose power - forget about wealth.

The revolution must take place in three stages:

1. Ultimatum to all major oligarchs (one hundred persons of Forbes list and a hundred more in hiding, but we all know whom) swear their allegiance to the Russian assets (all foreign and strategic national assets will now be controlled by special bodies).
2. Nationalization of major private properties of strategic importance.
3. Translation of patriotic representatives of big capital in the category of officials with the voluntary transfer of the property to the State. Defeat in the civil rights (including the deprivation of the right to vote, participation in election campaigns, etc.) to those that prefer to preserve capital in non-strategic, but in a significant scale.

The state should become an instrument of the People. This system be called as such "laocracy", literally, "power of the people (laos - Greek for "people").

In a bloody battle for Ukraine, we see the true face of capital - Ukrainian big business (oligarchs - Poroshenko, Kolomojsky, Ahemetov etc.) lead the genocide against the People; Russian oligarchs betray the people by engaging a criminal agreement with Ukrainian class partners. And all this is in the interests of the global oligarchy - the world capitalist system, centered in the United States.

Now exposes all incompatibility of Russia and capitalism. Either capitalism, or Russia. This is most clearly understood by Novorossia leaders. They, happening at the forefront of the whole Russian People, in fact started this Russian People's Revolution. That is why it's them that so furiously attacked the devotees junta mercenaries from the ranks of Ukrainian swine-fascists, as as well liberal capitalist elements in the

fifth and sixth columns from Russia. And most importantly they have become existential enemies of the U.S. and the World Government. Strelkov, Gubarev, Purgin, Pushilin, Mozgovoy - challenged global capital. And they did it on behalf of the People. In this case, on behalf of the Russian People. But if supporters of ukrainian People were consistent, they would have been allies of this Revolution, and not miserable hirelings of global capital - as they are now. Turning to the side of Novorossia, Ukrainians turn not as much to Russia, and not even on the Russian side, but on the side of the People, the People with a capital letter, which fights in a deadly battle with the world of Capital, to the side of LAOCRACY.

Therefore the coming campaign against Kiev will not just revenge and not only the liberation of the ancient Russian lands, it will be a campaign against Capital in favor of laocracy, the power of the People, for the People's State. I do not think that the Russian oligarchy will support this, it can not misunderstand that it's days are numbered. It's why it so hysterically screams "do not send troops", since victory of Novorossia will inevitably mean a revival of Russia itself, the awakening of the People. That is the reason for desperate attempts to betray Novorossia. This agony of the Russian oligarchy and its public hirelings. Their task - to destroy the heroes of the Revolution of Novorossian Revolution - not only Popular, but also social, and destroy it in the bud.

Traditionalism and Sociology/The Figure of the Radical Subject

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Traditionalism and Sociology/The Figure of the Radical Subject

(the lecture in Curitiba, Brazil - Colloquium on Evola, september 2012)

Ladies and gentlemen!

I want to thank the group of Curitiba who organized this conference with lectures as interesting as rich. Thank you for the invitation to speak here about Tradition. I apologize for my terrible and so imperfect Portuguese.

Part 1. Traditionalism and Sociology - The Modern and the Eternal

The first part is devoted to traditionalism and sociology, and also to the importance of Plato.

Traditionalism emphasizes the dualism that exists between two worlds: the world of tradition and the modern world. This dualism corresponds to two sociological categories: pre-modernity and modernity. This parallelism between traditionalism and sociology is very important and it is necessary to develop this affinity in the future.

In Paris, in 2011 I gave a lecture under the title: "René Guénon as a sociologist." René Guénon in his book "The Reign of Quantity and the Signs of the Times" used the traditional and sacred symbol of the Egg of the World. In Guénon's perspective, the pre-modern world corresponds to the Egg of the World open on the top and closed on the bottom. The spiritual rays enter the world and so the cosmic and material things receive the sacred qualities.

Modern society corresponds to the Egg of the World closed on the top and on the bottom. It is the materialistic, atheistic, consumerist civilization. That is, the scientific, mechanical and atomistic worldview. Postmodern society corresponds to the Egg of the World open on the bottom and closed on the top. It is the demonic post-human and post-social civilization. The reality in which we live. But for now let us put aside momentarily postmodernity, despite the great interest with which we could develop this correspondence.

The difference between traditionalism and sociology lies in the fact that sociology starts from modernity and judges Tradition from the point of view of modernity. Traditionalists do the opposite: they see modernity from the standpoint of Tradition. Modernity puts all reality in time, in history. Tradition considers things in light of eternity. So sociologists think pre-modernity diachronically as something past. Traditionalists regard modernity as an aspect of eternity, ie, as something eternal.

This, therefore, is not so easy to understand. Being totally ephemeral the illusion, the modern world as the world of radical perversion also, in a paradoxical way, belongs to eternity.

Traditionalists are neighbors of the structuralists. Tradition and modernity can both be seen as structures.

Important case: the sociologist Louis Dumont talked about two types of society - the holistic society and the individualistic society. Modernity is essentially individualistic. According to him, Marx was also partly individualistic, sharing with liberals the value of the individual man.

It is clear and evident that the tradition can survive in the modern world - by inertia. How can modernity exist in the traditional world?

Guénon spoke of Atlantis the disappeared ancient continent and made an allusion that the modern world, as a great parody, is the continuation of a certain decadent and very old perverted Tradition. The serpent already appears in paradise in the first era of human history.

The Neoplatonist Proclus in his commentary on the dialogue "Critias" of Plato, where we find the matter of Atlantis, described the war between the Greeks and the prehistoric people of Atlantis as the paradigmatic war between two orders of being: one perfect and the other degraded.

It is very interesting that Proclus said that the Greeks were connected to the earth and the Atlanteans to the sea. The Greeks were alongside the Olympian gods and the people of Atlantis alongside Titans. The maritime geopolitics of the Titans against the telluric geopolitics of the Gods.

Proclus is an ancient geopolitician. It is important that both worlds - Greek and Atlantean - are thought by Proclus as something synchronistic.

The second way to see this synchronism is with two philosophical traditions.

The first is the philosophy of Plato, Platonism. Platonism is a philosophy essentially vertical. Platonism is built around the vertical axis. Above are the Ideas. Below are the things, the phenomena. The Platonic world is the hierarchical, vertically organized world.

Another philosophy is the atomism of Democritus, Epicurus, Lucretius. This philosophy is democratic, it begins from below, by the material particles. It is the atomistic world. It doesn't know the ideas, the platonic lights. It doesn't know hierarchy. It goes against verticality.

Democritus was a pre-Socratic. He can be understood as a representative of the counter-initiation in the world of Tradition. Democritus is the representative of modernity in the pre-modern world.

There is a legend that Plato set the writings of Democritus on fire in his Academy. The platonicists regarded atomism as "the world upside down," the impossible world, the world contrary to the natural order of things.

In Islam Atomism is the doctrine of the ash'arites and of the aggressively anti-Sufi, anti-esoteric theologian, Ibn Taymiyyah, father of contemporary Wahhabism and Salafism.

Also: the Islamic tradition is pre-modern. Once more: we see in traditional society something "modern". After arriving at modernity atomism began to be the only scientific orthodoxy. Modernity is built on the

atomism of Democritus. It is the scientific paradigm of modernity. After Galileo, Newton, Gassendi, atomism is the dogma.

The Platonic philosophy is further marginalized. It is very significant that Karl Popper criticized Plato aggressively, calling Platonism "the greatest enemy of liberal open society."

Hence we can identify traditionalism and Platonism.

Modernity and tradition can be understood as two paradigms. Progressists insist on the fact that Tradition belongs in the past. Understood as paradigms everything changes: from this moment you can represent modernity and Tradition as the option to choose.

Why is this so important?

Modernity structurally understood is no longer destiny, something objective and inevitable, but the question of free choice. So we can choose to be modern - atomists, materialists, liberal democrats. But we can choose not to be modern. And we can be platonic, and stand alongside eternity. Eternity platonically understood isn't the past. Eternity is eternal. And therefore it is present.

The only thing left is to turn toward eternity. As in the verses of Arthur Rimbaud:

Elle est retrouvée. Quoi? Éternité.

C'est la mer avec le soleil allée.

It's found again. What? Eternity.

It is the sea gone off with the sun.

Part 2. The Figure of the Radical Subject and the Traditionalist without Tradition

There is the concept of Gottesnacht, "the night of God." It's the Iron Age, the modern world.

The Tradition is out. Modernity arrived. The organized world is replaced by the chaotic world. The sacred disappeared. Initiation as well. The man is in a vacuum.

This is a starting point of the traditionalists. They deny the modern world. They seek Tradition. The traditionalist awakens at the night of God (Gottesnacht).

Hölderlin asked - "Why poets in dark times?"

It is important this "why".

The Platonics thought that in the ages of gold are born the souls of gold - aristocrats, hence the ideal of kalakogathia. In the ages of iron are born the poor souls, insignificant, worthless. This is important: the poor souls do not realize they are in the Gottesnacht, in the night of God. For them the night is not the night. They no longer know what is light.

Poets possess pain. Others do not. Thus, the traditionalists, for possessing pain, they deny the modern world.

The question arises: why traditionalists in dark times?

We can build a hypothesis: the soul of gold was born in the age of iron. This explains the pain, tragedy, suffering. This explains why there is pain and suffering.

But why was she born? Was it a cosmic mistake? Or something else? And even more important why?

I think it is something else. It is not an error. It's the eschatological destiny, the mission. It is important: the pure case isn't the traditionalist by inertia, but the traditionalist by inability to accept the modern world, living without God, without the sacred. And this impossibility should be without direct or immanent reason. Only in this case the experiment is pure.

The extreme case: the traditionalist without Tradition. The differentiated man. Why the differentiated man? Here comes the figure of the Radical Subject.

The Radical Subject is the soul of gold in the Age of Iron. For the soul of gold is easy to be in the world of gold. But it is impossible to judge a priori: is man good because he lives in a traditional society, or because his soul is golden?

It's only possible to give an answer by putting the soul in the world of iron.

Radical Subject

The Radical Subject is in the night of God (Gottesnacht) to prove radically the quality of his soul.

This is the case of Julius Evola - above all in the first and last stages.

Is that all? It can be. Being traditionalist is the end per se and para se. But there is something very important, even decisive - he must die a traditionalist too, not abandoning or betraying his ideals.

Still, why the traditionalist in dark times: to put an end to the modern world.

This is not the ultimate goal, but it is the logical consequence. The struggle against modernity is essential ethical Subject Radical. You can't do otherwise. The Radical Subject is at the center of the night - between past and future. It is in the present. Eugene Golovin, the Russian traditionalist, said: "wherever we are, there is the center of hell."

It is necessary to understand modernity and postmodernity non-dually. The Radical Subject is advaitista. He is in the modern world and wants to be here, not beyond this world.

The Radical Subject is not afraid of modernity. The Radical Subject is the descent - Untergehende.

History is decay, is Untergang, descent.

There are four types of men, according to Martin Heidegger:

The simple and ignorant people, who can't choose anything. They change with the world and society.

Conservatives. They are afraid of the night of God, of decadence. They want to conserve what exists against the time which devours everything.

Progressives. They want to go in the direction of decay faster and faster still. They are the ones who are responsible for the current situation. The liberals, the world government, they together can be called "The Antichrist Collective".

There is also a fourth type: the new philosophers. They descend on the center of the night and are not afraid. That's where the danger is the greatest. Heidegger said about them: these philosophers are faced with the "hard knowledge of nihilism," schwere Wissen des Nihilismus.

The Radical Subject goes with the world without being of this world. It is itself a paradoxical manifestation of the end. I call it the "eurasist zen."

Thank you!

“Traditionalism as a Theory: Sophia, Plato and the Event” – Alexander Dugin (2013)

June 13, 2019

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 8 of In Search of the Dark Logos: Philosophico-Theological Outlines

(Moscow: Academic Project/Department of the Sociology of International Relations, Faculty of Sociology, Moscow State University, 2013).

***Mark Sedgwick and his hypothesis on Sophia Perennis

In his book, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* [1], the contemporary scholar and historian of Traditionalism, Mark Sedgwick, based on research into the philosophical sources of the worldview of the founder of Traditionalism, René Guénon, advanced the hypothesis that the Traditionalist movement, in its assertion of Sophia Perennis (Philosophia Perennis) and the “Primordial Tradition” as its foundational theory, is based not on some “mythical”, exotic, “Eastern” sources, but on none other than the Western philosophical tradition, whose roots can be traced back to the Renaissance Platonism of Gemistus Plethon, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Agostino Steuco, etc. The current which took shape in this circle elevated the figure of Sophia and the corresponding notion of “Primordial Theology” (as in Steuco’s *Prisca theologia*), and the content of this “primordial theology” boiled down to Platonism, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism, which were rediscovered in Western Europe thanks to translations from Greek of a broad spectrum of these currents, whose texts were brought by the Greek Gemistus Plethon from Byzantium in the final period before its final fall. Although Sedgwick’s thesis has seemed to many Traditionalists to be “disrobing”,

overall this analysis of the intellectual circles of the Renaissance Neoplatonists and their ideas demonstrates a considerable convergence with Guénon's views and those of his followers.

In turn, the works of the English Dame Frances Yates dedicated to these very same intellectual currents of the European Renaissance and Modernity [2] have shown just how enormous of an influence Platonism exerted on the formation of the philosophical, scientific, and political views of this transitional epoch. Both Sedgwick and Yates show how a significant number of the founding fathers of the modern scientific view of the world were in fact largely inspired by mystical-religious ideas and Neoplatonic theories, even though only one side of their works – that tied to empiricism, rationalism, mechanism, etc. – would make it into the scientific canons of Modernity, while the mysticism and “Perennialism” of the Renaissance would be left “behind the scenes” or alternatively interpreted in naturalistic, pantheistic, or deist directions. A prominent example of this is Issac Newton, who was both an alchemist and a Kabbalist on the one hand and, on the other, the founding father of mechanistic physics and rationalist, empiricist natural science. The historian of religions Mircea Eliade, who in his youth participated in the Traditionalist movement, developed this perspective with the proposal that we view the rational-scientific and progressist topography of the philosophy of Modernity as a product of the secularization of European Hermeticism.

These considerations led Sedgwick to reconsider the influence of Traditionalism on philosophy, science, and to a certain extent politics in the 20th century. This movement, lying at the heart of Modernity and appearing in new form as the philosophy developed by René Guénon, Julius Evola, and a broad circle of thinkers on which the former had decisive impact, was much more significant and important than can be judged on the basis of mere superficial familiarity with the subject. At the same time, they appear to be somewhat more modest and even, to a certain extent, marginal. At the source of Modernity lies Platonic universalism, which became the ideological grounds for proclaiming the universalism of the rational philosophy of post-Medieval Europe. Gradually, the bulk of attention came to be drawn towards the technological side of this movement, towards pure empiricism and rationalism, while the metaphysical dimension was neglected and written off as one of the costs and remnants of “Medieval irrationalism.” However, following this scheme, it turns out that with the exhaustion of the technocratic, rationalist philosophy, Baconist scientism, and Cartesian dualism of the epoch of Modernity, this second side, which had long since receded to the periphery, began to make itself known again. Guénon's Traditionalism became its developed manifesto. Hence the growth of Traditionalism's significance in correlation with the ever broader and deeper consciousness of the “crisis of the modern world.” Thus, in the transition to Post-Modernity, Modernity has once again remembered its “occult roots.” The Enlightenment, now called into question, has turned towards its “Rosicrucian” beginning.

This hypothesis of Sedgwick and Yates, shared by a number of other authors, is productive. In the very least, it raises the status of Traditionalism to that of one of the most important philosophical currents to emerge in the critical moment of the exhaustion of the agenda of the classical scientific rationality of Modernity and with the formation of the first Post-Modern theories subjecting Modernity to deconstruction. If we recognize that at the very heart of Modernity, which claimed rationalism and the theory of progress to be the foundations of its universalism, there lies a set of irrational views that appeal to deep antiquity for substantiation, i.e., the Platonic-mystical and Hermetic universalism of the Perennialist and Sophiological shade, then Modernity itself appears under a completely different light, and Post-Modern critics thereby acquire yet another argument, namely, that Modernity was not at all what it claimed to be, but was merely a poorly disguised, masked version of the traditional society which Modernity sought to overcome, annul, and dismantle.

On the other hand, Traditionalism itself thereby appears to be a phenomenon that is critical of, but nonetheless related to Modernity. It is not simply the “continuation of Tradition” by inertia, but an altogether specific and original critical philosophy which refutes Modernity and subjects the latter to merciless critique on the basis of a special, complex set of ideas and theories which, taken together in their sum, constitute a “Perennialism” or “universal esotericism” which, it ought to be noted, does not coincide with any one single really existing historical tradition. Thus, we are only one step away from recognizing Traditionalism to be a “construct.” The revolutionary, critical, and modern potential of Guénon’s philosophy was rightfully noticed by the Traditionalist René Alleau, who proposed to consider Guénon alongside Marx as one among the constellation of radical revolutionaries and critics of modern civilization.[3]

From *Prisca theologia* to René Guénon

A number of various, altogether interesting conclusions can be extracted from Sedgwick’s analysis.[4] Here we will fixate on merely one point, that of the conceptual unity of 20th century Traditionalism (Guénon, Evola, etc.) and Renaissance Platonism (Plethon, Ficino, Steuco, etc.). Both of these philosophical currents can be generalized with the notion of “Perennialism.”

If we can historically trace Guénon's philosophical inspirations back to the Renaissance, which Guénon himself harshly criticized for misunderstanding the sacred civilization of the Middle Ages, and if we can find there the first formulations of Sophia Perennis or the Prisca theologia which compose the foundation of Traditionalist philosophy, then in it becomes completely obvious that these currents came to Western Europe in the Renaissance from the much deeper past and, to a certain extent, from a different cultural context (more specifically, the Byzantine-Greek). Of course, Platonism was well known in Medieval European Scholasticism, but it had long since yielded to Averroism and Aristotelianism enshrined virtually dogmatically in the realism of Thomas Aquinas. Hermeticism had existed in the form of alchemical currents and esoteric fraternities, but in the Renaissance these tendencies surfaced in rather vivid and magistral form, such as in the forms of open Neoplatonism and philosophically-formulated Hermeticism (with numerous direct or indirect polytheistic elements), which claimed to be not merely a secret tradition parallel to the dominant Scholasticism, but a foundational, universal worldview. Renaissance Platonism and Hermeticism directly opposed Catholic Thomism and formulated the agenda of Renaissance Humanism. This humanism was magical and sacred: man was understood to be the "perfect man", the Platonic philosopher, the Angel-Initiator.

The Renaissance Platonists appealed directly to the works of Plato, Plotinus, Hermes Trismegistus, and the broader corpus of Neoplatonic and Hermetic theories, many of which were freshly translated from Greek. Platonic humanism was reformed into a conceptual, theoretical bloc and began its offensive against previous philosophical and theological constructs. The Neoplatonists justified their claims to truth by emphasizing the antiquity of their sources and by claiming to propose a philosophical paradigm which could generalize different religious confessions, and as such was more universal and more profound than the Catholic religion of Europe. This synthesis came to include, in the very least, Byzantine Orthodoxy, but the reform program of Gemistus Plethon was even broader, proposing a restoration of "Platonic theology" as a whole and a return to certain aspects of polytheism. Platonism, like Hermeticism, was seen not simply as one philosophical or religious tendency among many others, but as "universal wisdom" capable of serving as a key to the most diverse philosophies and religions, as a common denominator. This idea of a meta-religious generalization became the most important notion of the Rosicrucian movement and, later, European Masonry (as shown by Yates).

This universalism was substantiated by references to "Perennialism", to the existence of some kind of exclusive instance in which all of world wisdom, independently of historical peripeteia, is present and

preserved in its “paradisal”, primordial state. This “perennial wisdom”, Sophia, was the point of departure that allowed one to examine specific religions and philosophies as individual and historically conditioned constructs, thus laying claims to a universality transcending any and all individualities. This Sophia was knowable and, as follows, he who participated in her, loved her, and identified with her received access to “absolute knowledge.” Renaissance Humanism was therefore Sophiological. Sophia was treated as the Angel of humanity, the latter’s living and eternally present, eternally youthful archetype or *eidos*.

It is by all means possible that European Modernity’s claims to the universalism of its values are to be sought in precisely this source. As Catholic ecumenism was abandoned, the cultural messianism of the West demanded new substantiation, and such was found in “Perennialism”: the new Europe, post-Medieval Europe, conceived itself to be the privileged region of the revealed, eternal Sophia, and on these grounds the Europeans of Modernity acquired their mandate to newly master and conquer the world, seeing themselves as not merely raptorial colonizers, but as the bearers of higher universal knowledge. This explains the special incandescence of the era of geographical discoveries and (Francis Bacon’s) call to discover Atlantis not only in the new colonies, but in the Old World itself. Thus, Renaissance Platonism and its corresponding Perennialism ought to be considered a most important factor in the formation of the structure of Modernity as a whole. The profane universalism of progressist and rationalist Europe has its roots in the sacred super-rationalism of the Renaissance Platonists oriented towards eternity and deep antiquity.

The construct of Sophia

The “constructivist” character of Renaissance Neoplatonism is obvious to us. We can easily trace how and on what sources it was constructed. The Hermetic *Poimandres* and *Asclepius* attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, as well as the cosmological and anthropological dialogues of Plato (the *Timaeus*, the *Republic*, the *Laws*, the *Symposium*, etc.) were taken to be universal and interpreted in the spirit of the Neoplatonic systematizations of Plotinus and his followers. Neoplatonism situated Sophia as its main content, its systematized philosophical hologram. And it is through this prism that other religions and philosophical systems were interpreted as individual cases of a generalized perennial(ist) paradigm. René Guénon acted in approximately the same manner as he employed a system of definite metaphysical, cosmological, and anthropological views to examine various traditions, religions, and the modern world itself as a denial of these views and, in its final phase (the opening of the egg from below)

a parody of them. Not a single religion, theology, or philosophical system contains the paradigmatic matrix with which Guénon operated. But it is with the aid of this matrix, taken from somewhere else, that historical religions, theologies, and philosophers were altogether successfully treated and interpreted by him. Guénon based himself on the “Primordial Tradition”, sanātana dharma, or Sophia Perennis, and he drew his knowledge directly thither. The Renaissance Platonists acted in precisely the same way.

With Sophia, both the Renaissance Platonists and Guénon in the 20th century deconstructed everything else. The very algorithm of their deconstructions was, in turn, represented by a construct: the construct of Sophia.

The “Dark Logos” of Neoplatonism

The artificial character of Renaissance Perennialism is rather transparent. But here the question should be posed: how does this Renaissance Platonism, which lies at the origins of 20th century Traditionalism, relate to the Platonism on which it was constructed? In other words, was this constructivist nature a quality of the Renaissance anticipating Modernity, or did the very material upon which Renaissance Sophiology was constructed lend any definite grounds to this approach and display any convergent qualities?

With regards to Neoplatonism (from Plotinus and Porphyry through Iamblichus to Proclus and Damascius), this is nearly obvious: Neoplatonism presented a construct developed on the basis of the main ideas of Plato, but in synthesis with other Hellenistic and Middle Eastern philosophical, religious, and mystical systems. This Neoplatonism was distinguished by its extraordinary inclusivity: it selectively incorporated Platonic re-interpretations of Aristotle (and accordingly, a re-thinking of the Stoa), Orphism, Pythagoreanism, Egyptian Hermetism, cults from Syria and Asia Minor (theurgy, the Chaldean Oracles), and Iranian dualist doctrines and Chaldean astrology. On the basis of Plato’s Parmenides and his main hypotheses, Proclus constructed an elaborate “Platonic theology” which was carried on and substantially re-interpreted by Damascius. The latter’s commentaries on the Timaeus thoroughly and in great detail described a synthetic cosmology built on the principle of noocentrism.

The system that the late Neoplatonists of the Hellenistic era built with their open metaphysics and apophatic, dialectical Logos can, without a doubt, be fully considered to be an earlier version of the "Perennialism" which we encounter in the Renaissance. In Proclus' works, particularly his exegeses, we can see the skeleton of all the later derivations of Neoplatonism, both religious and philosophical. His theories and methods can unmistakably be sensed in the Areopagites and, further, in the whole tradition of "mystical theology" which became so widespread in the West (from Scotus Eriugena to Meister Eckhart, Henry Suso, and Jakob Böhme) as well as in the East. We can find the dialectic of the uncreated One developed by Proclus in the works of the Islamic thinkers of Al-Falasifa, in Ibn Arabi and the Ishraq school, whereby it defined the dramatic picture of Ishmailite theology and eschatology. Moreover, the classical method of Kabbalistic interpretations of the Zohar and early Kabbalah fully reproduced Proclus' fixation on certain words and phrases (and their numerological equivalents) in Plato's dialogues which at other times seemed only secondary. Henry Corbin rightly noted that the Parmenides was for Proclus the Theogony, on the basis of which he would later develop his Platonic Theology. Plato's Parmenides was a kind of Bible or Sacred Scripture for negative, Neoplatonic, apophatic theology.[5] Every word of Plato's was subjected to detailed and comprehensive hermeneutics. The idea that Plato was the "sail" of the Divine became a Neoplatonic dogma in its own right.

Neoplatonism conceived itself to be a universal tradition on the basis of which one could interpret all existing religions and philosophical systems. It was the religion of the Logos, a noocentric cosmology and apophatic metaphysics claiming the ability to interpret any and all forms of polytheism, symbolism, and theurgic rites. Following the Greek Neoplatonists, this idea penetrated other religious environments as well, such as in the works of al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, the Sufis, the philosophers of the Ishraq school, the initiatic verses of Rumi and the diaries of Ruzbehan Baqli, to the synthetic doctrines of Haydar Amoli or Mulla Sadra. Something analogous can also be encountered in Kabbalah, as well as in Christian mysticism (with some reservations). Everywhere we look, we encounter the idea of Sophia Perennis and spiritual universalism, reproducing in one form or another the noocentric, and at times paradoxical and dialectical, "Dark Logos" of the Neoplatonists. This Logos is "dark" because it postulates the pre-existential nature of the Principial (the One), the vertical of the Logos is opened upwards, and because it constantly and repeatedly upturns the strict laws of Aristotelian reason with its foundational principles of triumph, denial, excluding the third. Instead of logical clarity, we are dealing here with a paradox, an aporia, or a super-rational ambiguity (amphibole) which is evasive, demanding of the high art of dialectics, and which leads the "philosopher" (whether the Sufi, the adept, or the initiate) through the dizzying chain of insights and initiations, upon each new link of which consciousness collapses and is recreated anew.

Having established this state of affairs, we can easily extend the history of Renaissance Platonism and its Perennialist construct of Sophia even further back than a millennium. Gemistus Plethon and his Neoplatonic reform in Mystras on the eve of the fall of the Byzantine Empire can be seen as a link in the direct transmission of this tradition from the last Diadochi of the Athenian Academy expelled by Justinian, to Michael Psellos, to the unsuccessful Neoplatonist deemed heretic John Italus, and to the Florentine circle established by Marsilio Ficino around Prince Cosimo Medici. In addition to the Greek branch, we can also consider the "Islamic trace", where the Dark Logos of apophatic "Platonic theology" became the common denominator of a wide range of different currents representing the heights of Muslim philosophy, theology, and culture. Another route ran through Jewish Kabbalah, which was structured according to the very same algorithm. Finally, in the Latin world, we can see the numerous streams of Hermeticism, alchemy, mysticism, as well as all Gnostic sects and millenarian currents (in the spirit of the doctrine of the Three Kingdoms of the Calabrian Joachim de Flore) which flowed into the revolutionary ocean of the Renaissance. Still further from the Renaissance, following Sedgwick and Yates and numerous other authors studying modern mystical and occult orders, lodges, and sects, we can trace the line of the dark Logos through even more reliable and well-researched material, from Giordano Bruno to the Rosicrucians, Masons, mystics, and the representatives of "occultism" among whom Guénon discovered it and laid it at the heart of his completely original and extremely influential Traditionalist philosophy.

Thus, tracing the genesis of this construct of Sophia leads us to the history of the Logos as it has unfolded in the periphery of Western European culture and, as Corbin has shown, in the center of the Islamic spiritual tradition (where the "Dark Logos" was not exclusive and one, but was adjacent to and sometimes sharply rivaled rationalist kalam, Asharite atomism, Fiqh, and Salafist purism). The difficult reception of Kabbalah in the Jewish world and its nearly full and final acceptance as a flawless orthodoxy make up yet another page in this history. Jewish Kabbalah fell into the sphere of interests of the Renaissance Neoplatonists, and in the works of Pico della Mirandola and Reuchlin (and later of Knorr von Rosenroth) we can detect the outlines of a project to establish a "Christian Kabbalah." Further, once again through Masonry and Hermeticism, Kabbalah reached Fabre d'Olivet, Eliphas Lévi, Papus, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, and Guénon himself. In Guénon and in his "revolutionary" Perennialism, all of these numerous streams come together to compose the most modern, capacious, and systematized worldview.

Theory as Homeland

Now we are left with posing a final question, namely: To what extent did the Neoplatonists of the first centuries of our era create something completely unique and original out of the texts, ideas, and traditions associated with the name of Plato, and to what extent can we find something similar in the works of Plato himself? Here the works of the great scholar of Plato, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism, the French curé André-Jean Festugière, come to our aid.[6] Festugière draws our attention to the meaning imbued in the notion of “Theory” (θεορία) in Plato’s era and in his own philosophy. Originally, this notion meant an “inspection”, “survey”, “contemplation”, “meditation”, or “observation.” In Ancient Greece, in philosophical milieus, it bore two subtle terminological nuances:

A “theory” was a survey of the cultures and societies of different peoples, among whom the philosopher should travel and dwell as part of his preparation for a new life (hence why we constantly read of the travels of philosophers to other countries: “traveling” is a purely philosophical occupation).

By analogy with the survey of different peoples, societies, and their religious and ritual systems, a “theory” was a survey of different systems and ideological connections leading to a higher principle.

This connection between traveling and theoretical contemplation is extremely important. Theory is the contemplation of that which is different, taken to culminate in a common, universal model. Plato’s doctrine of ideas itself is directly associated with contemplation. The contemplation of ideas is active “theorizing”, or the distinguishing of common and unchanging paradigms as well as constantly changing phenomena. Just as the Hellenic philosophical traveler studies the religions and customs of different Mediterranean societies, seeks correspondences with the Greek religion and Greek traditions, establishes analogies and, when necessary, replenishes his own religious views and his language, so does the Hellenic philosopher contemplate ideas, the universals of the infinite order of things and phenomena. There are many societies, religions, and cults, and the contemplative traveler strives to deduce from his survey that which is common, that which he has already identified in the places he has been and in the new, still unknown countries and lands in which he finds himself. The case is strictly the same with immersion into the world of ideas and in the process of comparing them with the world of phenomena. Contemplation and theory are the construction of the common, the culmination of a model.

In Plato, this acquires a distinct and salient character. Theory as construction is simultaneously illumination, enlightenment, and absorbing the rays of the Good. Ideas are indifferent to things, but they are not indifferent to those who strive to theorize, whom they passionately rush to meet, in excelsis. The field of theory thus transforms into the space of epiphany, where ideas are not only reflected, but acquire a specific being and are embodied in the theoretical existence of the philosopher. By traveling to temples and shrines to various gods and by being present at different rituals, the theoretician (the one who contemplates) prepares to meet with the real God for whom all the different gods of different cults serve as masks, names, and messengers (angels). In different rites and sacred ceremonies, the philosopher rushes to the main philosophical rite, the rite of rites, where the main realization to be accomplished is the discerned merger of the noetic cosmos with the aesthetic cosmos, the “fulfillment of all fulfillments”, the magical meeting of God with the raging sea of multiplicity. Later, this ritual of all rituals would be conceptualized by the Neoplatonists as theurgy.

Plato’s Theory is therefore not simply a preparation for something – for political activism or sacred rites – but is a higher form of reality, the ultimate expression of concentrated praxis. Contemplation is thus the work of the gods, and is their blissful rest and the source of higher pleasure. Theory is the place where being, dispersed into multitude and elusive in difference, is tied together into the knot of intense concentration, finding in itself elastic unity and bright clarity. The contemplative philosopher stands above the priest and the king, for he rises to the zone of pure divinity, un-diluted by any additional functional burdens and completely free from multiplicity, both temporal (the change of moments) and spatial (the change of places). The culmination of this journey is the return to the philosophical Homeland, where there is no more time or relative forms. Theory is the Homeland. None other than nostalgia for it pushes the philosopher to travel through both countries and the networks of light-like ideas in search of the point of Sophia, whom the philosopher loves with all his being.

This understanding of Theory illustrates how Plato’s philosophy was that very synthetic universalism which generalizes different philosophical systems and knowledge just as the traveler generalizes the experience of the societies he witnesses. Plato’s works therefore present not one point of view to one or another question, but always several; they become material for contemplation and, like steps, they lead to a higher synthesis. At the peak of this synthesis, ideas begin to live beyond the discursive Platonic text and reveal themselves directly to those who have followed Plato and the personages of his dialogues to the very end, where the stairs leading to the sky end. There dialogue ends, but theory does not. Now the philosopher must take one more step, this time without Plato and texts – this is the step of thought, the step of illumination, the step of contemplation. The step into the sky. Only there does real Platonism –

the “secret doctrine” – begin. It has not been transmitted to anyone; it can only be discovered independently, through the sacred experience of theory.

Open Philosophy

As the formulator of theory, as the guide to the geography of ideas, Plato created a consciously open philosophy, in which the main point is not uttered, but must be sought and experienced independently. Hence the term “philo-soph”, or “lover of Sophia”, of Wisdom. If the question at hand was simply who bears this Wisdom, we would be dealing with a closed system, that is, something individual. Wisdom cannot be learned, it is not a given. One can only break through to it upon enormous labor and at the cost of incredible efforts. Philosophy is the realm where minds and hearts gather together in passionately thirsting for Wisdom, where they are fallen in love with Sophia and are excited contenders for her hand. No one has any guarantees. There is only Love. Led by Her, they embark on their journey, towards contemplation, towards theory. They settle in the vicinity of Sophia and inch ever closer to her. They seek the universal, and thereby themselves become more and more generalized, eidetic, and less and less individual. Philosophers construct themselves in the vicinity of Wisdom. Purifying themselves in Her rays, they reveal evermore distinct contours.

In the case of Plato, this means that we are dealing with the Logos as such, for the Logos is in its nearly original form, is still undefined, and is open to being opened or closed, understood in one way or another, or conceived and outlined in one or another vector. In Plato, philosophy is the sharp impulse of nearing Sophia Perennis, the leap into the ocean of eternal light, it is contemplative and divine praxis. In this sense, philosophy is higher than religion and myth, insofar as religions and myths are but testimonies to the main actor – Saint Sophia. Therefore, Plato himself can be called a “Perennialist” and, correspondingly, a Traditionalist. It does not matter whether Plato adhered to Greek civil piety and offered sacrifices to the gods and heroes of his polis. Such was part of a much more important and significant philosophical cult: the cult of Sophia, the cult of the pure Logos.

Plato as an Event

Let us pose the final question. Did “Perennialism”, Traditionalism, universalism, and the philosophical cult of Sophia all begin with Plato’s Theory? With his doctrine of ideas? With his Timaeon cosmology?

For Guénon and Traditionalists, such a personification would be a scandal. But upon fully recognizing Plato’s direct connection to the “Primordial Tradition”, Traditionalists would undoubtedly begin to see Plato as a link in the golden chain of initiates which stretches back to the dawn of creation, to the earthly paradise, and which has become increasingly difficult to access, closed, and exclusive in our time, the Kali Yuga, the “end times”, the era of the “great parody.” Traditionalists understand “perennialism” literally and even somewhat naively. Such can by all means be seen as a symmetrical response to the just as literal and even more naive historicism which predominates in Modernity. Yet in the vicinity of eternity, “before” and “after”, “now” and “then” are not so important. Indeed, they have no meaning. What is important is what. Plato, like Zarathustra in Iran, might have been both an historical figure and a sacred personage, like al-Khidr or the Angel-Initiator. Perhaps there are multiple Platos. And this means that Plato’s spirit can be called upon (as Plotinus did in the temple of Isis); he can be appealed to. His return can be awaited, for there is no irreversibility in eternity. In eternity, everything is reversible – everything has even already been reversed. In the most rationalized form, one could accept that Plato merely transmitted knowledge that he had acquired along the chain of initiation, and in this sense was their ordinary re-translator who became world famous only by virtue of the importance of the truths he voiced, as a kind of philosophical prophet.

Yet Plato can be approached in other ways as well, for example, as an Event in the spirit of the Heideggerian Ereignis. This would distance us from both the “Perennialists” and the “historicists.” Plato happened and philosophy happened. Sophia was designated and the philosophical geography was marked. If this was supposed to have happened, then it would have happened no matter what – whether by way of Plato or someone else, should we be reproached on this matter. But perhaps it would be better to think differently: if Plato did not exist, there would be nothing else. In particular, there would be no notes in the margins of his texts. There would be no philosophy. If Plato was in fact divine, then he cannot be subordinated to any mechanical necessity. Nothing can oblige him to be. Further, if he had not risked everything to become Plato, his philosophy would have been negligible. Thus, Sophia might not have been. Or in other words: instead of Sophia, instead of the secret bride of the order of lovers, something else could have been revealed to Plato.

Plato's exceptionality (although perhaps this is just as wrong and does not correspond to the truth) is more existentially attractive and productive than his link in the chain, even if it is the golden one. Plato's divinity lies in that he was human.

Modern Traditionalism is, of course, more adequate than profane academic philosophy and is more prosperous than Post-Modernity. But all the signs of Traditionalism's transformation into a convention, a routine, into a "scholasticism", of its conscious quenching of any living movement of the soul or heart, are glaring. Here it is discovered that "Perennialism" is a construct and always was such from the very beginning. The appeal of a Traditionalist towards really existing tradition decides nothing, just as Plato's reverence for his paternal gods did not exhaust his philosophy.

Traditionalism is something other than tradition. It is a breakthrough to that which is the tradition of traditions, the secret grain, the theory. But being a theory, a construct, it needs to be continuously recreated. A construct is not so bad if the matter at hand is something rooted in the light nature of man himself. By creating, man creates himself. Therefore, Traditionalism must either happen or disappear. Its claims are too enormous and its bar has been set too high by Guénon and the Sophiologists on whom he constructed his doctrine. "Perennialism" means that Sophia is Perennis: she is here and now. But how can we relate the fact of the Kali Yuga, our God-forsaken "now" and the dustbin of the modern Western-centric global world, our vile, desolate "here", with the rays of the Angel-Initiator, the light of Great Love, and the nature of man as a winged divine being? The Gnostics offered a dualist answer which often seems to be the only one acceptable and applicable to us. But is this not simply a recognition of our own weakness, of our own personal inability to transform the "Cover" into the "Mirror", Absence into Presence, apophany into epiphany, and occultation into revelation? Is this not the signature on the warrant for the death of the Logos, the insuperability of Western nihilism, or the recognition of the closed, self-referential world to be the only possible and real?

Traditionalists frequently speak of the "great parody" that is the modern world. This is true, but are they themselves not a parody? After all, not only Guénon, but the Neoplatonists, and Plato himself can all be parodied.

The discrepancies between Traditionalism and Heidegger did not hinder Henry Corbin from engaging Neoplatonism in Islam with love and delicate refinement over the course of his life. Such is the behavior of a living person who responds to Sophia's whisper no matter where it resounds.

Today this whisper is more silent than ever. But it cannot be so quiet as to be indistinguishable at all. We must learn to listen to silence, for silence sometimes conveys extremely meaningful things.

Footnotes:

[1] Mark Sedgwick, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[2] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Saint Petersburg: 1997); Ibidem., *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (Moscow: Aletheia, Enigma, 1999); Ibidem., *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2000).

[3] René Alleau, *De Marx à Guénon: d'une critique 'radicale' à une critique 'principielle' des sociétés modernes* (Paris, Les dossiers H., 1984).

[4] Some aspects of this question have already been treated in Alexander Dugin, *Postfilosofiia* (Moscow: Eurasian Movement, 2009).

[5] Henry Corbin, *Le paradoxe du monothéisme* (Paris, 1981).

[6] André-Jean Festugière, *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2009).

“Traditionalism as a Theory: Sophia, Plato and the Event” – Alexander Dugin (2013)

June 13, 2019

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 8 of In Search of the Dark Logos: Philosophico-Theological Outlines

(Moscow: Academic Project/Department of the Sociology of International Relations, Faculty of Sociology, Moscow State University, 2013).

Mark Sedgwick and his hypothesis on Sophia Perennis

In his book, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* [1], the contemporary scholar and historian of Traditionalism, Mark Sedgwick, based on research into the philosophical sources of the worldview of the founder of Traditionalism, René Guénon, advanced the hypothesis that the Traditionalist movement, in its assertion of Sophia Perennis (Philosophia Perennis) and the “Primordial Tradition” as its foundational theory, is based not on some “mythical”, exotic, “Eastern” sources, but on none other than the Western philosophical tradition, whose roots can be traced back to the Renaissance Platonism of Gemistus Plethon, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Agostino Steuco, etc. The current which took shape in this circle elevated the figure of Sophia and the corresponding notion of “Primordial Theology” (as in Steuco’s *Prisca theologia*), and the content of this “primordial theology” boiled down to Platonism, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism, which were rediscovered in Western Europe thanks to translations from Greek of a broad spectrum of these currents, whose texts were brought by the Greek Gemistus Plethon from Byzantium in the final period before its final fall. Although Sedgwick’s thesis has seemed to many Traditionalists to be “disrobing”,

overall this analysis of the intellectual circles of the Renaissance Neoplatonists and their ideas demonstrates a considerable convergence with Guénon's views and those of his followers.

In turn, the works of the English Dame Frances Yates dedicated to these very same intellectual currents of the European Renaissance and Modernity [2] have shown just how enormous of an influence Platonism exerted on the formation of the philosophical, scientific, and political views of this transitional epoch. Both Sedgwick and Yates show how a significant number of the founding fathers of the modern scientific view of the world were in fact largely inspired by mystical-religious ideas and Neoplatonic theories, even though only one side of their works – that tied to empiricism, rationalism, mechanism, etc. – would make it into the scientific canons of Modernity, while the mysticism and “Perennialism” of the Renaissance would be left “behind the scenes” or alternatively interpreted in naturalistic, pantheistic, or deist directions. A prominent example of this is Issac Newton, who was both an alchemist and a Kabbalist on the one hand and, on the other, the founding father of mechanistic physics and rationalist, empiricist natural science. The historian of religions Mircea Eliade, who in his youth participated in the Traditionalist movement, developed this perspective with the proposal that we view the rational-scientific and progressist topography of the philosophy of Modernity as a product of the secularization of European Hermeticism.

These considerations led Sedgwick to reconsider the influence of Traditionalism on philosophy, science, and to a certain extent politics in the 20th century. This movement, lying at the heart of Modernity and appearing in new form as the philosophy developed by René Guénon, Julius Evola, and a broad circle of thinkers on which the former had decisive impact, was much more significant and important than can be judged on the basis of mere superficial familiarity with the subject. At the same time, they appear to be somewhat more modest and even, to a certain extent, marginal. At the source of Modernity lies Platonic universalism, which became the ideological grounds for proclaiming the universalism of the rational philosophy of post-Medieval Europe. Gradually, the bulk of attention came to be drawn towards the technological side of this movement, towards pure empiricism and rationalism, while the metaphysical dimension was neglected and written off as one of the costs and remnants of “Medieval irrationalism.” However, following this scheme, it turns out that with the exhaustion of the technocratic, rationalist philosophy, Baconist scientism, and Cartesian dualism of the epoch of Modernity, this second side, which had long since receded to the periphery, began to make itself known again. Guénon's Traditionalism became its developed manifesto. Hence the growth of Traditionalism's significance in correlation with the ever broader and deeper consciousness of the “crisis of the modern world.” Thus, in the transition to Post-Modernity, Modernity has once again remembered its “occult roots.” The Enlightenment, now called into question, has turned towards its “Rosicrucian” beginning.

This hypothesis of Sedgwick and Yates, shared by a number of other authors, is productive. In the very least, it raises the status of Traditionalism to that of one of the most important philosophical currents to emerge in the critical moment of the exhaustion of the agenda of the classical scientific rationality of Modernity and with the formation of the first Post-Modern theories subjecting Modernity to deconstruction. If we recognize that at the very heart of Modernity, which claimed rationalism and the theory of progress to be the foundations of its universalism, there lies a set of irrational views that appeal to deep antiquity for substantiation, i.e., the Platonic-mystical and Hermetic universalism of the Perennialist and Sophiological shade, then Modernity itself appears under a completely different light, and Post-Modern critics thereby acquire yet another argument, namely, that Modernity was not at all what it claimed to be, but was merely a poorly disguised, masked version of the traditional society which Modernity sought to overcome, annul, and dismantle.

On the other hand, Traditionalism itself thereby appears to be a phenomenon that is critical of, but nonetheless related to Modernity. It is not simply the “continuation of Tradition” by inertia, but an altogether specific and original critical philosophy which refutes Modernity and subjects the latter to merciless critique on the basis of a special, complex set of ideas and theories which, taken together in their sum, constitute a “Perennialism” or “universal esotericism” which, it ought to be noted, does not coincide with any one single really existing historical tradition. Thus, we are only one step away from recognizing Traditionalism to be a “construct.” The revolutionary, critical, and modern potential of Guénon’s philosophy was rightfully noticed by the Traditionalist René Alleau, who proposed to consider Guénon alongside Marx as one among the constellation of radical revolutionaries and critics of modern civilization.[3]

From Prisca theologia to René Guénon

A number of various, altogether interesting conclusions can be extracted from Sedgwick’s analysis.[4] Here we will fixate on merely one point, that of the conceptual unity of 20th century Traditionalism (Guénon, Evola, etc.) and Renaissance Platonism (Plethon, Ficino, Steuco, etc.). Both of these philosophical currents can be generalized with the notion of “Perennialism.”

If we can historically trace Guénon's philosophical inspirations back to the Renaissance, which Guénon himself harshly criticized for misunderstanding the sacred civilization of the Middle Ages, and if we can find there the first formulations of Sophia Perennis or the Prisca theologia which compose the foundation of Traditionalist philosophy, then in it becomes completely obvious that these currents came to Western Europe in the Renaissance from the much deeper past and, to a certain extent, from a different cultural context (more specifically, the Byzantine-Greek). Of course, Platonism was well known in Medieval European Scholasticism, but it had long since yielded to Averroism and Aristotelianism enshrined virtually dogmatically in the realism of Thomas Aquinas. Hermeticism had existed in the form of alchemical currents and esoteric fraternities, but in the Renaissance these tendencies surfaced in rather vivid and magistral form, such as in the forms of open Neoplatonism and philosophically-formulated Hermeticism (with numerous direct or indirect polytheistic elements), which claimed to be not merely a secret tradition parallel to the dominant Scholasticism, but a foundational, universal worldview. Renaissance Platonism and Hermeticism directly opposed Catholic Thomism and formulated the agenda of Renaissance Humanism. This humanism was magical and sacred: man was understood to be the "perfect man", the Platonic philosopher, the Angel-Initiator.

The Renaissance Platonists appealed directly to the works of Plato, Plotinus, Hermes Trismegistus, and the broader corpus of Neoplatonic and Hermetic theories, many of which were freshly translated from Greek. Platonic humanism was reformed into a conceptual, theoretical bloc and began its offensive against previous philosophical and theological constructs. The Neoplatonists justified their claims to truth by emphasizing the antiquity of their sources and by claiming to propose a philosophical paradigm which could generalize different religious confessions, and as such was more universal and more profound than the Catholic religion of Europe. This synthesis came to include, in the very least, Byzantine Orthodoxy, but the reform program of Gemistus Plethon was even broader, proposing a restoration of "Platonic theology" as a whole and a return to certain aspects of polytheism. Platonism, like Hermeticism, was seen not simply as one philosophical or religious tendency among many others, but as "universal wisdom" capable of serving as a key to the most diverse philosophies and religions, as a common denominator. This idea of a meta-religious generalization became the most important notion of the Rosicrucian movement and, later, European Masonry (as shown by Yates).

This universalism was substantiated by references to "Perennialism", to the existence of some kind of exclusive instance in which all of world wisdom, independently of historical peripeteia, is present and

preserved in its “paradisaal”, primordial state. This “perennial wisdom”, Sophia, was the point of departure that allowed one to examine specific religions and philosophies as individual and historically conditioned constructs, thus laying claims to a universality transcending any and all individualities. This Sophia was knowable and, as follows, he who participated in her, loved her, and identified with her received access to “absolute knowledge.” Renaissance Humanism was therefore Sophiological. Sophia was treated as the Angel of humanity, the latter’s living and eternally present, eternally youthful archetype or *eidos*.

It is by all means possible that European Modernity’s claims to the universalism of its values are to be sought in precisely this source. As Catholic ecumenism was abandoned, the cultural messianism of the West demanded new substantiation, and such was found in “Perennialism”: the new Europe, post-Medieval Europe, conceived itself to be the privileged region of the revealed, eternal Sophia, and on these grounds the Europeans of Modernity acquired their mandate to newly master and conquer the world, seeing themselves as not merely raptorial colonizers, but as the bearers of higher universal knowledge. This explains the special incandescence of the era of geographical discoveries and (Francis Bacon’s) call to discover Atlantis not only in the new colonies, but in the Old World itself. Thus, Renaissance Platonism and its corresponding Perennialism ought to be considered a most important factor in the formation of the structure of Modernity as a whole. The profane universalism of progressist and rationalist Europe has its roots in the sacred super-rationalism of the Renaissance Platonists oriented towards eternity and deep antiquity.

The construct of Sophia

The “constructivist” character of Renaissance Neoplatonism is obvious to us. We can easily trace how and on what sources it was constructed. The Hermetic *Poimandres* and *Asclepius* attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, as well as the cosmological and anthropological dialogues of Plato (the *Timaeus*, the *Republic*, the *Laws*, the *Symposium*, etc.) were taken to be universal and interpreted in the spirit of the Neoplatonic systematizations of Plotinus and his followers. Neoplatonism situated Sophia as its main content, its systematized philosophical hologram. And it is through this prism that other religions and philosophical systems were interpreted as individual cases of a generalized perennial(ist) paradigm. René Guénon acted in approximately the same manner as he employed a system of definite metaphysical, cosmological, and anthropological views to examine various traditions, religions, and the modern world itself as a denial of these views and, in its final phase (the opening of the egg from below)

a parody of them. Not a single religion, theology, or philosophical system contains the paradigmatic matrix with which Guénon operated. But it is with the aid of this matrix, taken from somewhere else, that historical religions, theologies, and philosophers were altogether successfully treated and interpreted by him. Guénon based himself on the “Primordial Tradition”, *sanātana dharma*, or *Sophia Perennis*, and he drew his knowledge directly thither. The Renaissance Platonists acted in precisely the same way.

With *Sophia*, both the Renaissance Platonists and Guénon in the 20th century deconstructed everything else. The very algorithm of their deconstructions was, in turn, represented by a construct: the construct of *Sophia*.

The “Dark Logos” of Neoplatonism

The artificial character of Renaissance Perennialism is rather transparent. But here the question should be posed: how does this Renaissance Platonism, which lies at the origins of 20th century Traditionalism, relate to the Platonism on which it was constructed? In other words, was this constructivist nature a quality of the Renaissance anticipating Modernity, or did the very material upon which Renaissance Sophiology was constructed lend any definite grounds to this approach and display any convergent qualities?

With regards to Neoplatonism (from Plotinus and Porphyry through Iamblichus to Proclus and Damascius), this is nearly obvious: Neoplatonism presented a construct developed on the basis of the main ideas of Plato, but in synthesis with other Hellenistic and Middle Eastern philosophical, religious, and mystical systems. This Neoplatonism was distinguished by its extraordinary inclusivity: it selectively incorporated Platonic re-interpretations of Aristotle (and accordingly, a re-thinking of the Stoa), Orphism, Pythagoreanism, Egyptian Hermetism, cults from Syria and Asia Minor (theurgy, the Chaldean Oracles), and Iranian dualist doctrines and Chaldean astrology. On the basis of Plato’s *Parmenides* and his main hypotheses, Proclus constructed an elaborate “Platonic theology” which was carried on and substantially re-interpreted by Damascius. The latter’s commentaries on the *Timaeus* thoroughly and in great detail described a synthetic cosmology built on the principle of noocentrism.

The system that the late Neoplatonists of the Hellenistic era built with their open metaphysics and apophatic, dialectical Logos can, without a doubt, be fully considered to be an earlier version of the "Perennialism" which we encounter in the Renaissance. In Proclus' works, particularly his exegeses, we can see the skeleton of all the later derivations of Neoplatonism, both religious and philosophical. His theories and methods can unmistakably be sensed in the Areopagites and, further, in the whole tradition of "mystical theology" which became so widespread in the West (from Scotus Eriugena to Meister Eckhart, Henry Suso, and Jakob Böhme) as well as in the East. We can find the dialectic of the uncreated One developed by Proclus in the works of the Islamic thinkers of Al-Falasifa, in Ibn Arabi and the Ishraq school, whereby it defined the dramatic picture of Ishmailite theology and eschatology. Moreover, the classical method of Kabbalistic interpretations of the Zohar and early Kabbalah fully reproduced Proclus' fixation on certain words and phrases (and their numerological equivalents) in Plato's dialogues which at other times seemed only secondary. Henry Corbin rightly noted that the Parmenides was for Proclus the Theogony, on the basis of which he would later develop his Platonic Theology. Plato's Parmenides was a kind of Bible or Sacred Scripture for negative, Neoplatonic, apophatic theology.[5] Every word of Plato's was subjected to detailed and comprehensive hermeneutics. The idea that Plato was the "sail" of the Divine became a Neoplatonic dogma in its own right.

Neoplatonism conceived itself to be a universal tradition on the basis of which one could interpret all existing religions and philosophical systems. It was the religion of the Logos, a noocentric cosmology and apophatic metaphysics claiming the ability to interpret any and all forms of polytheism, symbolism, and theurgic rites. Following the Greek Neoplatonists, this idea penetrated other religious environments as well, such as in the works of al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, the Sufis, the philosophers of the Ishraq school, the initiatic verses of Rumi and the diaries of Ruzbehan Baqli, to the synthetic doctrines of Haydar Amoli or Mulla Sadra. Something analogous can also be encountered in Kabbalah, as well as in Christian mysticism (with some reservations). Everywhere we look, we encounter the idea of Sophia Perennis and spiritual universalism, reproducing in one form or another the noocentric, and at times paradoxical and dialectical, "Dark Logos" of the Neoplatonists. This Logos is "dark" because it postulates the pre-existential nature of the Principial (the One), the vertical of the Logos is opened upwards, and because it constantly and repeatedly upturns the strict laws of Aristotelian reason with its foundational principles of triumph, denial, excluding the third. Instead of logical clarity, we are dealing here with a paradox, an aporia, or a super-rational ambiguity (amphibole) which is evasive, demanding of the high art of dialectics, and which leads the "philosopher" (whether the Sufi, the adept, or the initiate) through the dizzying chain of insights and initiations, upon each new link of which consciousness collapses and is recreated anew.

Having established this state of affairs, we can easily extend the history of Renaissance Platonism and its Perennialist construct of Sophia even further back than a millennium. Gemistus Plethon and his Neoplatonic reform in Mystras on the eve of the fall of the Byzantine Empire can be seen as a link in the direct transmission of this tradition from the last Diadochi of the Athenian Academy expelled by Justinian, to Michael Psellos, to the unsuccessful Neoplatonist deemed heretic John Italus, and to the Florentine circle established by Marsilio Ficino around Prince Cosimo Medici. In addition to the Greek branch, we can also consider the "Islamic trace", where the Dark Logos of apophatic "Platonic theology" became the common denominator of a wide range of different currents representing the heights of Muslim philosophy, theology, and culture. Another route ran through Jewish Kabbalah, which was structured according to the very same algorithm. Finally, in the Latin world, we can see the numerous streams of Hermeticism, alchemy, mysticism, as well as all Gnostic sects and millenarian currents (in the spirit of the doctrine of the Three Kingdoms of the Calabrian Joachim de Flore) which flowed into the revolutionary ocean of the Renaissance. Still further from the Renaissance, following Sedgwick and Yates and numerous other authors studying modern mystical and occult orders, lodges, and sects, we can trace the line of the dark Logos through even more reliable and well-researched material, from Giordano Bruno to the Rosicrucians, Masons, mystics, and the representatives of "occultism" among whom Guénon discovered it and laid it at the heart of his completely original and extremely influential Traditionalist philosophy.

Thus, tracing the genesis of this construct of Sophia leads us to the history of the Logos as it has unfolded in the periphery of Western European culture and, as Corbin has shown, in the center of the Islamic spiritual tradition (where the "Dark Logos" was not exclusive and one, but was adjacent to and sometimes sharply rivaled rationalist kalam, Asharite atomism, Fiqh, and Salafist purism). The difficult reception of Kabbalah in the Jewish world and its nearly full and final acceptance as a flawless orthodoxy make up yet another page in this history. Jewish Kabbalah fell into the sphere of interests of the Renaissance Neoplatonists, and in the works of Pico della Mirandola and Reuchlin (and later of Knorr von Rosenroth) we can detect the outlines of a project to establish a "Christian Kabbalah." Further, once again through Masonry and Hermeticism, Kabbalah reached Fabre d'Olivet, Eliphas Lévi, Papus, Saint-Yves d'Alveydre, and Guénon himself. In Guénon and in his "revolutionary" Perennialism, all of these numerous streams come together to compose the most modern, capacious, and systematized worldview.

Theory as Homeland

Now we are left with posing a final question, namely: To what extent did the Neoplatonists of the first centuries of our era create something completely unique and original out of the texts, ideas, and traditions associated with the name of Plato, and to what extent can we find something similar in the works of Plato himself? Here the works of the great scholar of Plato, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism, the French curé André-Jean Festugière, come to our aid.[6] Festugière draws our attention to the meaning imbued in the notion of “Theory” (θεορία) in Plato’s era and in his own philosophy. Originally, this notion meant an “inspection”, “survey”, “contemplation”, “meditation”, or “observation.” In Ancient Greece, in philosophical milieus, it bore two subtle terminological nuances:

A “theory” was a survey of the cultures and societies of different peoples, among whom the philosopher should travel and dwell as part of his preparation for a new life (hence why we constantly read of the travels of philosophers to other countries: “traveling” is a purely philosophical occupation).

By analogy with the survey of different peoples, societies, and their religious and ritual systems, a “theory” was a survey of different systems and ideological connections leading to a higher principle.

This connection between traveling and theoretical contemplation is extremely important. Theory is the contemplation of that which is different, taken to culminate in a common, universal model. Plato’s doctrine of ideas itself is directly associated with contemplation. The contemplation of ideas is active “theorizing”, or the distinguishing of common and unchanging paradigms as well as constantly changing phenomena. Just as the Hellenic philosophical traveler studies the religions and customs of different Mediterranean societies, seeks correspondences with the Greek religion and Greek traditions, establishes analogies and, when necessary, replenishes his own religious views and his language, so does the Hellenic philosopher contemplate ideas, the universals of the infinite order of things and phenomena. There are many societies, religions, and cults, and the contemplative traveler strives to deduce from his survey that which is common, that which he has already identified in the places he has been and in the new, still unknown countries and lands in which he finds himself. The case is strictly the same with immersion into the world of ideas and in the process of comparing them with the world of phenomena. Contemplation and theory are the construction of the common, the culmination of a model.

In Plato, this acquires a distinct and salient character. Theory as construction is simultaneously illumination, enlightenment, and absorbing the rays of the Good. Ideas are indifferent to things, but they are not indifferent to those who strive to theorize, whom they passionately rush to meet, in excelsis. The field of theory thus transforms into the space of epiphany, where ideas are not only reflected, but acquire a specific being and are embodied in the theoretical existence of the philosopher. By traveling to temples and shrines to various gods and by being present at different rituals, the theoretician (the one who contemplates) prepares to meet with the real God for whom all the different gods of different cults serve as masks, names, and messengers (angels). In different rites and sacred ceremonies, the philosopher rushes to the main philosophical rite, the rite of rites, where the main realization to be accomplished is the discerned merger of the noetic cosmos with the aesthetic cosmos, the “fulfillment of all fulfillments”, the magical meeting of God with the raging sea of multiplicity. Later, this ritual of all rituals would be conceptualized by the Neoplatonists as theurgy.

Plato's Theory is therefore not simply a preparation for something – for political activism or sacred rites – but is a higher form of reality, the ultimate expression of concentrated praxis. Contemplation is thus the work of the gods, and is their blissful rest and the source of higher pleasure. Theory is the place where being, dispersed into multitude and elusive in difference, is tied together into the knot of intense concentration, finding in itself elastic unity and bright clarity. The contemplative philosopher stands above the priest and the king, for he rises to the zone of pure divinity, un-diluted by any additional functional burdens and completely free from multiplicity, both temporal (the change of moments) and spatial (the change of places). The culmination of this journey is the return to the philosophical Homeland, where there is no more time or relative forms. Theory is the Homeland. None other than nostalgia for it pushes the philosopher to travel through both countries and the networks of light-like ideas in search of the point of Sophia, whom the philosopher loves with all his being.

This understanding of Theory illustrates how Plato's philosophy was that very synthetic universalism which generalizes different philosophical systems and knowledge just as the traveler generalizes the experience of the societies he witnesses. Plato's works therefore present not one point of view to one or another question, but always several; they become material for contemplation and, like steps, they lead to a higher synthesis. At the peak of this synthesis, ideas begin to live beyond the discursive Platonic text and reveal themselves directly to those who have followed Plato and the personages of his dialogues to the very end, where the stairs leading to the sky end. There dialogue ends, but theory does not. Now the philosopher must take one more step, this time without Plato and texts – this is the step of thought, the step of illumination, the step of contemplation. The step into the sky. Only there does real Platonism –

the “secret doctrine” – begin. It has not been transmitted to anyone; it can only be discovered independently, through the sacred experience of theory.

Open Philosophy

As the formulator of theory, as the guide to the geography of ideas, Plato created a consciously open philosophy, in which the main point is not uttered, but must be sought and experienced independently. Hence the term “philo-soph”, or “lover of Sophia”, of Wisdom. If the question at hand was simply who bears this Wisdom, we would be dealing with a closed system, that is, something individual. Wisdom cannot be learned, it is not a given. One can only break through to it upon enormous labor and at the cost of incredible efforts. Philosophy is the realm where minds and hearts gather together in passionately thirsting for Wisdom, where they are fallen in love with Sophia and are excited contenders for her hand. No one has any guarantees. There is only Love. Led by Her, they embark on their journey, towards contemplation, towards theory. They settle in the vicinity of Sophia and inch ever closer to her. They seek the universal, and thereby themselves become more and more generalized, eidetic, and less and less individual. Philosophers construct themselves in the vicinity of Wisdom. Purifying themselves in Her rays, they reveal evermore distinct contours.

In the case of Plato, this means that we are dealing with the Logos as such, for the Logos is in its nearly original form, is still undefined, and is open to being opened or closed, understood in one way or another, or conceived and outlined in one or another vector. In Plato, philosophy is the sharp impulse of nearing Sophia Perennis, the leap into the ocean of eternal light, it is contemplative and divine praxis. In this sense, philosophy is higher than religion and myth, insofar as religions and myths are but testimonies to the main actor – Saint Sophia. Therefore, Plato himself can be called a “Perennialist” and, correspondingly, a Traditionalist. It does not matter whether Plato adhered to Greek civil piety and offered sacrifices to the gods and heroes of his polis. Such was part of a much more important and significant philosophical cult: the cult of Sophia, the cult of the pure Logos.

Plato as an Event

Let us pose the final question. Did “Perennialism”, Traditionalism, universalism, and the philosophical cult of Sophia all begin with Plato’s Theory? With his doctrine of ideas? With his Timaeon cosmology?

For Guénon and Traditionalists, such a personification would be a scandal. But upon fully recognizing Plato’s direct connection to the “Primordial Tradition”, Traditionalists would undoubtedly begin to see Plato as a link in the golden chain of initiates which stretches back to the dawn of creation, to the earthly paradise, and which has become increasingly difficult to access, closed, and exclusive in our time, the Kali Yuga, the “end times”, the era of the “great parody.” Traditionalists understand “perennialism” literally and even somewhat naively. Such can by all means be seen as a symmetrical response to the just as literal and even more naive historicism which predominates in Modernity. Yet in the vicinity of eternity, “before” and “after”, “now” and “then” are not so important. Indeed, they have no meaning. What is important is what. Plato, like Zarathustra in Iran, might have been both an historical figure and a sacred personage, like al-Khidr or the Angel-Initiator. Perhaps there are multiple Platos. And this means that Plato’s spirit can be called upon (as Plotinus did in the temple of Isis); he can be appealed to. His return can be awaited, for there is no irreversibility in eternity. In eternity, everything is reversible – everything has even already been reversed. In the most rationalized form, one could accept that Plato merely transmitted knowledge that he had acquired along the chain of initiation, and in this sense was their ordinary re-translator who became world famous only by virtue of the importance of the truths he voiced, as a kind of philosophical prophet.

Yet Plato can be approached in other ways as well, for example, as an Event in the spirit of the Heideggerian Ereignis. This would distance us from both the “Perennialists” and the “historicists.” Plato happened and philosophy happened. Sophia was designated and the philosophical geography was marked. If this was supposed to have happened, then it would have happened no matter what – whether by way of Plato or someone else, should we be reproached on this matter. But perhaps it would be better to think differently: if Plato did not exist, there would be nothing else. In particular, there would be no notes in the margins of his texts. There would be no philosophy. If Plato was in fact divine, then he cannot be subordinated to any mechanical necessity. Nothing can oblige him to be. Further, if he had not risked everything to become Plato, his philosophy would have been negligible. Thus, Sophia might not have been. Or in other words: instead of Sophia, instead of the secret bride of the order of lovers, something else could have been revealed to Plato.

Plato's exceptionality (although perhaps this is just as wrong and does not correspond to the truth) is more existentially attractive and productive than his link in the chain, even if it is the golden one. Plato's divinity lies in that he was human.

Modern Traditionalism is, of course, more adequate than profane academic philosophy and is more prosperous than Post-Modernity. But all the signs of Traditionalism's transformation into a convention, a routine, into a "scholasticism", of its conscious quenching of any living movement of the soul or heart, are glaring. Here it is discovered that "Perennialism" is a construct and always was such from the very beginning. The appeal of a Traditionalist towards really existing tradition decides nothing, just as Plato's reverence for his paternal gods did not exhaust his philosophy.

Traditionalism is something other than tradition. It is a breakthrough to that which is the tradition of traditions, the secret grain, the theory. But being a theory, a construct, it needs to be continuously recreated. A construct is not so bad if the matter at hand is something rooted in the light nature of man himself. By creating, man creates himself. Therefore, Traditionalism must either happen or disappear. Its claims are too enormous and its bar has been set too high by Guénon and the Sophiologists on whom he constructed his doctrine. "Perennialism" means that Sophia is Perennis: she is here and now. But how can we relate the fact of the Kali Yuga, our God-forsaken "now" and the dustbin of the modern Western-centric global world, our vile, desolate "here", with the rays of the Angel-Initiator, the light of Great Love, and the nature of man as a winged divine being? The Gnostics offered a dualist answer which often seems to be the only one acceptable and applicable to us. But is this not simply a recognition of our own weakness, of our own personal inability to transform the "Cover" into the "Mirror", Absence into Presence, apophany into epiphany, and occultation into revelation? Is this not the signature on the warrant for the death of the Logos, the insuperability of Western nihilism, or the recognition of the closed, self-referential world to be the only possible and real?

Traditionalists frequently speak of the "great parody" that is the modern world. This is true, but are they themselves not a parody? After all, not only Guénon, but the Neoplatonists, and Plato himself can all be parodied.

The discrepancies between Traditionalism and Heidegger did not hinder Henry Corbin from engaging Neoplatonism in Islam with love and delicate refinement over the course of his life. Such is the behavior of a living person who responds to Sophia's whisper no matter where it resounds.

Today this whisper is more silent than ever. But it cannot be so quiet as to be indistinguishable at all. We must learn to listen to silence, for silence sometimes conveys extremely meaningful things.

Footnotes:

[1] Mark Sedgwick, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[2] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Saint Petersburg: 1997); Ibidem., *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (Moscow: Aletheia, Enigma, 1999); Ibidem., *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2000).

[3] René Alleau, *De Marx à Guénon: d'une critique 'radicale' à une critique 'principielle' des sociétés modernes* (Paris, Les dossiers H., 1984).

[4] Some aspects of this question have already been treated in Alexander Dugin, *Postfilosofia* (Moscow: Eurasian Movement, 2009).

[5] Henry Corbin, *Le paradoxe du monothéisme* (Paris, 1981).

[6] André-Jean Festugière, *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2009).

Share this:

TRADITIONALISM AS A THEORY: SOPHIA, PLATO AND THE EVENT

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Mark Sedgwick and his hypothesis on Sophia Perennis

In his book, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* [1], the contemporary scholar and historian of Traditionalism, Mark Sedgwick, based on research into the philosophical sources of the worldview of the founder of Traditionalism, René Guénon, advanced the hypothesis that the Traditionalist movement, in its assertion of Sophia Perennis (Philosophia Perennis) and the “Primordial Tradition” as its foundational theory, is based not on some “mythical”, exotic, “Eastern” sources, but on none other than the Western philosophical tradition, whose roots can be traced back to the Renaissance Platonism of Gemistus Plethon, Marsilio Ficino, Pico della Mirandola, Agostino Steuco, etc. The current which took shape in this circle elevated the figure of Sophia and the corresponding notion of “Primordial Theology” (as in Steuco’s *Prisca theologia*), and the content of this “primordial theology” boiled down to Platonism, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism, which were rediscovered in Western Europe thanks to translations from Greek of a broad spectrum of these currents, whose texts were brought by the Greek Gemistus Plethon from Byzantium in the final period before its final fall. Although Sedgwick’s thesis has seemed to many Traditionalists to be “disrobing”, overall this analysis of the intellectual circles of the Renaissance Neoplatonists and their ideas demonstrates a considerable convergence with Guénon’s views and those of his followers.

In turn, the works of the English Dame Frances Yates dedicated to these very same intellectual currents of the European Renaissance and Modernity [2] have shown just how enormous of an influence Platonism exerted on the formation of the philosophical, scientific, and political views of this transitional epoch. Both Sedgwick and Yates show how a significant number of the founding fathers of the modern scientific view of the world were in fact largely inspired by mystical-religious ideas and Neoplatonic theories, even though only one side of their works – that tied to empiricism, rationalism, mechanism, etc. – would make it into the scientific canons of Modernity, while the mysticism and “Perennialism” of the Renaissance would be left “behind the scenes” or alternatively interpreted in naturalistic, pantheistic, or deist directions. A prominent example of this is Issac Newton, who was both an alchemist and a Kabbalist on the one hand and, on the other, the founding father of mechanistic physics and rationalist, empiricist natural science. The historian of religions Mircea Eliade, who in his youth participated in the Traditionalist movement, developed this perspective with the proposal that we view

the rational-scientific and progressist topography of the philosophy of Modernity as a product of the secularization of European Hermeticism.

These considerations led Sedgwick to reconsider the influence of Traditionalism on philosophy, science, and to a certain extent politics in the 20th century. This movement, lying at the heart of Modernity and appearing in new form as the philosophy developed by René Guénon, Julius Evola, and a broad circle of thinkers on which the former had decisive impact, was much more significant and important than can be judged on the basis of mere superficial familiarity with the subject. At the same time, they appear to be somewhat more modest and even, to a certain extent, marginal. At the source of Modernity lies Platonic universalism, which became the ideological grounds for proclaiming the universalism of the rational philosophy of post-Medieval Europe. Gradually, the bulk of attention came to be drawn towards the technological side of this movement, towards pure empiricism and rationalism, while the metaphysical dimension was neglected and written off as one of the costs and remnants of “Medieval irrationalism.” However, following this scheme, it turns out that with the exhaustion of the technocratic, rationalist philosophy, Baconist scientism, and Cartesian dualism of the epoch of Modernity, this second side, which had long since receded to the periphery, began to make itself known again. Guénon’s Traditionalism became its developed manifesto. Hence the growth of Traditionalism’s significance in correlation with the ever broader and deeper consciousness of the “crisis of the modern world.” Thus, in the transition to Post-Modernity, Modernity has once again remembered its “occult roots.” The Enlightenment, now called into question, has turned towards its “Rosicrucian” beginning.

This hypothesis of Sedgwick and Yates, shared by a number of other authors, is productive. In the very least, it raises the status of Traditionalism to that of one of the most important philosophical currents to emerge in the critical moment of the exhaustion of the agenda of the classical scientific rationality of Modernity and with the formation of the first Post-Modern theories subjecting Modernity to deconstruction. If we recognize that at the very heart of Modernity, which claimed rationalism and the theory of progress to be the foundations of its universalism, there lies a set of irrational views that appeal to deep antiquity for substantiation, i.e., the Platonic-mystical and Hermetic universalism of the Perennialist and Sophiological shade, then Modernity itself appears under a completely different light, and Post-Modern critics thereby acquire yet another argument, namely, that Modernity was not at all what it claimed to be, but was merely a poorly disguised, masked version of the traditional society which Modernity sought to overcome, annul, and dismantle.

On the other hand, Traditionalism itself thereby appears to be a phenomenon that is critical of, but nonetheless related to Modernity. It is not simply the “continuation of Tradition” by inertia, but an altogether specific and original critical philosophy which refutes Modernity and subjects the latter to merciless critique on the basis of a special, complex set of ideas and theories which, taken together in their sum, constitute a “Perennialism” or “universal esotericism” which, it ought to be noted, does not

coincide with any one single really existing historical tradition. Thus, we are only one step away from recognizing Traditionalism to be a “construct.” The revolutionary, critical, and modern potential of Guénon’s philosophy was rightfully noticed by the Traditionalist René Alleau, who proposed to consider Guénon alongside Marx as one among the constellation of radical revolutionaries and critics of modern civilization.[3]

From *Prisca theologia* to René Guénon

A number of various, altogether interesting conclusions can be extracted from Sedgwick’s analysis.[4] Here we will fixate on merely one point, that of the conceptual unity of 20th century Traditionalism (Guénon, Evola, etc.) and Renaissance Platonism (Plethon, Ficino, Steuco, etc.). Both of these philosophical currents can be generalized with the notion of “Perennialism.”

If we can historically trace Guénon’s philosophical inspirations back to the Renaissance, which Guénon himself harshly criticized for misunderstanding the sacred civilization of the Middle Ages, and if we can find there the first formulations of *Sophia Perennis* or the *Prisca theologia* which compose the foundation of Traditionalist philosophy, then in it becomes completely obvious that these currents came to Western Europe in the Renaissance from the much deeper past and, to a certain extent, from a different cultural context (more specifically, the Byzantine-Greek). Of course, Platonism was well known in Medieval European Scholasticism, but it had long since yielded to Averroism and Aristotelianism enshrined virtually dogmatically in the realism of Thomas Aquinas. Hermeticism had existed in the form of alchemical currents and esoteric fraternities, but in the Renaissance these tendencies surfaced in rather vivid and magistral form, such as in the forms of open Neoplatonism and philosophically-formulated Hermeticism (with numerous direct or indirect polytheistic elements), which claimed to be not merely a secret tradition parallel to the dominant Scholasticism, but a foundational, universal worldview. Renaissance Platonism and Hermeticism directly opposed Catholic Thomism and formulated the agenda of Renaissance Humanism. This humanism was magical and sacred: man was understood to be the “perfect man”, the Platonic philosopher, the Angel-Initiator.

The Renaissance Platonists appealed directly to the works of Plato, Plotinus, Hermes Trismegistus, and the broader corpus of Neoplatonic and Hermetic theories, many of which were freshly translated from Greek. Platonic humanism was reformed into a conceptual, theoretical bloc and began its offensive against previous philosophical and theological constructs. The Neoplatonists justified their claims to truth by emphasizing the antiquity of their sources and by claiming to propose a philosophical paradigm which could generalize different religious confessions, and as such was more universal and more profound than the Catholic religion of Europe. This synthesis came to include, in the very least,

Byzantine Orthodoxy, but the reform program of Gemistus Plethon was even broader, proposing a restoration of "Platonic theology" as a whole and a return to certain aspects of polytheism. Platonism, like Hermeticism, was seen not simply as one philosophical or religious tendency among many others, but as "universal wisdom" capable of serving as a key to the most diverse philosophies and religions, as a common denominator. This idea of a meta-religious generalization became the most important notion of the Rosicrucian movement and, later, European Masonry (as shown by Yates).

This universalism was substantiated by references to "Perennialism", to the existence of some kind of exclusive instance in which all of world wisdom, independently of historical peripeteia, is present and preserved in its "paradise", primordial state. This "perennial wisdom", Sophia, was the point of departure that allowed one to examine specific religions and philosophies as individual and historically conditioned constructs, thus laying claims to a universality transcending any and all individualities. This Sophia was knowable and, as follows, he who participated in her, loved her, and identified with her received access to "absolute knowledge." Renaissance Humanism was therefore Sophiological. Sophia was treated as the Angel of humanity, the latter's living and eternally present, eternally youthful archetype or *eidos*.

It is by all means possible that European Modernity's claims to the universalism of its values are to be sought in precisely this source. As Catholic ecumenism was abandoned, the cultural messianism of the West demanded new substantiation, and such was found in "Perennialism": the new Europe, post-Medieval Europe, conceived itself to be the privileged region of the revealed, eternal Sophia, and on these grounds the Europeans of Modernity acquired their mandate to newly master and conquer the world, seeing themselves as not merely raptorial colonizers, but as the bearers of higher universal knowledge. This explains the special incandescence of the era of geographical discoveries and (Francis Bacon's) call to discover Atlantis not only in the new colonies, but in the Old World itself. Thus, Renaissance Platonism and its corresponding Perennialism ought to be considered a most important factor in the formation of the structure of Modernity as a whole. The profane universalism of progressist and rationalist Europe has its roots in the sacred super-rationalism of the Renaissance Platonists oriented towards eternity and deep antiquity.

The construct of Sophia

The "constructivist" character of Renaissance Neoplatonism is obvious to us. We can easily trace how and on what sources it was constructed. The Hermetic Poimandres and Asclepius attributed to Hermes Trismegistus, as well as the cosmological and anthropological dialogues of Plato (the *Timaeus*, the *Republic*, the *Laws*, the *Symposium*, etc.) were taken to be universal and interpreted in the spirit of the

Neoplatonic systematizations of Plotinus and his followers. Neoplatonism situated Sophia as its main content, its systematized philosophical hologram. And it is through this prism that other religions and philosophical systems were interpreted as individual cases of a generalized perennial(ist) paradigm. René Guénon acted in approximately the same manner as he employed a system of definite metaphysical, cosmological, and anthropological views to examine various traditions, religions, and the modern world itself as a denial of these views and, in its final phase (the opening of the egg from below) a parody of them. Not a single religion, theology, or philosophical system contains the paradigmatic matrix with which Guénon operated. But it is with the aid of this matrix, taken from somewhere else, that historical religions, theologies, and philosophers were altogether successfully treated and interpreted by him. Guénon based himself on the “Primordial Tradition”, sanātana dharma, or Sophia Perennis, and he drew his knowledge directly thither. The Renaissance Platonists acted in precisely the same way.

With Sophia, both the Renaissance Platonists and Guénon in the 20th century deconstructed everything else. The very algorithm of their deconstructions was, in turn, represented by a construct: the construct of Sophia.

The “Dark Logos” of Neoplatonism

The artificial character of Renaissance Perennialism is rather transparent. But here the question should be posed: how does this Renaissance Platonism, which lies at the origins of 20th century Traditionalism, relate to the Platonism on which it was constructed? In other words, was this constructivist nature a quality of the Renaissance anticipating Modernity, or did the very material upon which Renaissance Sophiology was constructed lend any definite grounds to this approach and display any convergent qualities?

With regards to Neoplatonism (from Plotinus and Porphyry through Iamblichus to Proclus and Damascius), this is nearly obvious: Neoplatonism presented a construct developed on the basis of the main ideas of Plato, but in synthesis with other Hellenistic and Middle Eastern philosophical, religious, and mystical systems. This Neoplatonism was distinguished by its extraordinary inclusivity: it selectively incorporated Platonic re-interpretations of Aristotle (and accordingly, a re-thinking of the Stoa), Orphism, Pythagoreanism, Egyptian Hermetism, cults from Syria and Asia Minor (theurgy, the Chaldean Oracles), and Iranian dualist doctrines and Chaldean astrology. On the basis of Plato’s Parmenides and his main hypotheses, Proclus constructed an elaborate “Platonic theology” which was carried on and substantially re-interpreted by Damascius. The latter’s commentaries on the *Timaeus* thoroughly and in great detail described a synthetic cosmology built on the principle of noocentrism.

The system that the late Neoplatonists of the Hellenistic era built with their open metaphysics and apophatic, dialectical Logos can, without a doubt, be fully considered to be an earlier version of the “Perennialism” which we encounter in the Renaissance. In Proclus’ works, particularly his exegeses, we can see the skeleton of all the later derivations of Neoplatonism, both religious and philosophical. His theories and methods can unmistakably be sensed in the Areopagites and, further, in the whole tradition of “mystical theology” which became so widespread in the West (from Scotus Eriugena to Meister Eckhart, Henry Suso, and Jakob Böhme) as well as in the East. We can find the dialectic of the uncreated One developed by Proclus in the works of the Islamic thinkers of Al-Falasifa, in Ibn Arabi and the Ishraq school, whereby it defined the dramatic picture of Ishmailite theology and eschatology. Moreover, the classical method of Kabbalistic interpretations of the Zohar and early Kabbalah fully reproduced Proclus’ fixation on certain words and phrases (and their numerological equivalents) in Plato’s dialogues which at other times seemed only secondary. Henry Corbin rightly noted that the Parmenides was for Proclus the Theogony, on the basis of which he would later develop his Platonic Theology. Plato’s Parmenides was a kind of Bible or Sacred Scripture for negative, Neoplatonic, apophatic theology.[5] Every word of Plato’s was subjected to detailed and comprehensive hermeneutics. The idea that Plato was the “sail” of the Divine became a Neoplatonic dogma in its own right.

Neoplatonism conceived itself to be a universal tradition on the basis of which one could interpret all existing religions and philosophical systems. It was the religion of the Logos, a noocentric cosmology and apophatic metaphysics claiming the ability to interpret any and all forms of polytheism, symbolism, and theurgic rites. Following the Greek Neoplatonists, this idea penetrated other religious environments as well, such as in the works of al-Farabi and Ibn Sina, the Sufis, the philosophers of the Ishraq school, the initiatic verses of Rumi and the diaries of Ruzbehan Baqli, to the synthetic doctrines of Haydar Amoli or Mulla Sadra. Something analogous can also be encountered in Kabbalah, as well as in Christian mysticism (with some reservations). Everywhere we look, we encounter the idea of Sophia Perennis and spiritual universalism, reproducing in one form or another the noocentric, and at times paradoxical and dialectical, “Dark Logos” of the Neoplatonists. This Logos is “dark” because it postulates the pre-existential nature of the Principial (the One), the vertical of the Logos is opened upwards, and because it constantly and repeatedly upturns the strict laws of Aristotelian reason with its foundational principles of triumph, denial, excluding the third. Instead of logical clarity, we are dealing here with a paradox, an aporia, or a super-rational ambiguity (amphibole) which is evasive, demanding of the high art of dialectics, and which leads the “philosopher” (whether the Sufi, the adept, or the initiate) through the dizzying chain of insights and initiations, upon each new link of which consciousness collapses and is recreated anew.

Having established this state of affairs, we can easily extend the history of Renaissance Platonism and its Perennialist construct of Sophia even further back than a millennium. Gemistus Plethon and his Neoplatonic reform in Mystras on the eve of the fall of the Byzantine Empire can be seen as a link in the direct transmission of this tradition from the last Diadochi of the Athenian Academy expelled by Justinian, to Michael Psellos, to the unsuccessful Neoplatonist deemed heretic John Italus, and to the Florentine circle established by Marsilio Ficino around Prince Cosimo Medici. In addition to the Greek branch, we can also consider the “Islamic trace”, where the Dark Logos of apophatic “Platonic theology” became the common denominator of a wide range of different currents representing the heights of Muslim philosophy, theology, and culture. Another route ran through Jewish Kabbalah, which was structured according to the very same algorithm. Finally, in the Latin world, we can see the numerous streams of Hermeticism, alchemy, mysticism, as well as all Gnostic sects and millenarian currents (in the spirit of the doctrine of the Three Kingdoms of the Calabrian Joachim de Flore) which flowed into the revolutionary ocean of the Renaissance. Still further from the Renaissance, following Sedgwick and Yates and numerous other authors studying modern mystical and occult orders, lodges, and sects, we can trace the line of the dark Logos through even more reliable and well-researched material, from Giordano Bruno to the Rosicrucians, Masons, mystics, and the representatives of “occultism” among whom Guénon discovered it and laid it at the heart of his completely original and extremely influential Traditionalist philosophy.

Thus, tracing the genesis of this construct of Sophia leads us to the history of the Logos as it has unfolded in the periphery of Western European culture and, as Corbin has shown, in the center of the Islamic spiritual tradition (where the “Dark Logos” was not exclusive and one, but was adjacent to and sometimes sharply rivaled rationalist kalam, Asharite atomism, Fiqr, and Salafist purism). The difficult reception of Kabbalah in the Jewish world and its nearly full and final acceptance as a flawless orthodoxy make up yet another page in this history. Jewish Kabbalah fell into the sphere of interests of the Renaissance Neoplatonists, and in the works of Pico della Mirandola and Reuchlin (and later of Knorr von Rosenroth) we can detect the outlines of a project to establish a “Christian Kabbalah.” Further, once again through Masonry and Hermeticism, Kabbalah reached Fabre d’Olivet, Eliphas Lévi, Papus, Saint-Yves d’Alveydre, and Guénon himself. In Guénon and in his “revolutionary” Perennialism, all of these numerous streams come together to compose the most modern, capacious, and systematized worldview.

Theory as Homeland

Now we are left with posing a final question, namely: To what extent did the Neoplatonists of the first centuries of our era create something completely unique and original out of the texts, ideas, and traditions associated with the name of Plato, and to what extent can we find something similar in the works of Plato himself? Here the works of the great scholar of Plato, Neoplatonism, and Hermeticism,

the French curé André-Jean Festiègere, come to our aid.[6] Festiègere draws our attention to the meaning imbued in the notion of "Theory" (θεορία) in Plato's era and in his own philosophy. Originally, this notion meant an "inspection", "survey", "contemplation", "meditation", or "observation." In Ancient Greece, in philosophical milieus, it bore two subtle terminological nuances:

A "theory" was a survey of the cultures and societies of different peoples, among whom the philosopher should travel and dwell as part of his preparation for a new life (hence why we constantly read of the travels of philosophers to other countries: "traveling" is a purely philosophical occupation).

By analogy with the survey of different nations, societies, and their religious and ritual systems, a "theory" was a survey of different systems and ideological connections leading to a higher principle.

This connection between traveling and theoretical contemplation is extremely important. Theory is the contemplation of that which is different, taken to culminate in a common, universal model. Plato's doctrine of ideas itself is directly associated with contemplation. The contemplation of ideas is active "theorizing", or the distinguishing of common and unchanging paradigms as well as constantly changing phenomena. Just as the Hellenic philosophical traveler studies the religions and customs of different Mediterranean societies, seeks correspondences with the Greek religion and Greek traditions, establishes analogies and, when necessary, replenishes his own religious views and his language, so does the Hellenic philosopher contemplate ideas, the universals of the infinite order of things and phenomena. There are many societies, religions, and cults, and the contemplative traveler strives to deduce from his survey that which is common, that which he has already identified in the places he has been and in the new, still unknown countries and lands in which he finds himself. The case is strictly the same with immersion into the world of ideas and in the process of comparing them with the world of phenomena. Contemplation and theory are the construction of the common, the culmination of a model.

In Plato, this acquires a distinct and salient character. Theory as construction is simultaneously illumination, enlightenment, and absorbing the rays of the Good. Ideas are indifferent to things, but they are not indifferent to those who strive to theorize, whom they passionately rush to meet, in excelsis. The field of theory thus transforms into the space of epiphany, where ideas are not only reflected, but acquire a specific being and are embodied in the theoretical existence of the philosopher. By traveling to temples and shrines to various gods and by being present at different rituals, the theoretician (the one who contemplates) prepares to meet with the real God for whom all the different gods of different cults serve as masks, names, and messengers (angels). In different rites and sacred ceremonies, the philosopher rushes to the main philosophical rite, the rite of rites, where the main realization to be accomplished is the discerned merger of the noetic cosmos with the aesthetic cosmos, the "fulfillment of all fulfillments", the magical meeting of God with the raging sea of multiplicity. Later, this ritual of all rituals would be conceptualized by the Neoplatonists as theurgy.

Plato's Theory is therefore not simply a preparation for something – for political activism or sacred rites – but is a higher form of reality, the ultimate expression of concentrated praxis. Contemplation is thus the work of the gods, and is their blissful rest and the source of higher pleasure. Theory is the place where being, dispersed into multitude and elusive in difference, is tied together into the knot of intense concentration, finding in itself elastic unity and bright clarity. The contemplative philosopher stands above the priest and the king, for he rises to the zone of pure divinity, un-diluted by any additional functional burdens and completely free from multiplicity, both temporal (the change of moments) and spatial (the change of places). The culmination of this journey is the return to the philosophical Homeland, where there is no more time or relative forms. Theory is the Homeland. None other than nostalgia for it pushes the philosopher to travel through both countries and the networks of light-like ideas in search of the point of Sophia, whom the philosopher loves with all his being.

This understanding of Theory illustrates how Plato's philosophy was that very synthetic universalism which generalizes different philosophical systems and knowledge just as the traveler generalizes the experience of the societies he witnesses. Plato's works therefore present not one point of view to one or another question, but always several; they become material for contemplation and, like steps, they lead to a higher synthesis. At the peak of this synthesis, ideas begin to live beyond the discursive Platonic text and reveal themselves directly to those who have followed Plato and the personages of his dialogues to the very end, where the stairs leading to the sky end. There dialogue ends, but theory does not. Now the philosopher must take one more step, this time without Plato and texts – this is the step of thought, the step of illumination, the step of contemplation. The step into the sky. Only there does real Platonism – the "secret doctrine" – begin. It has not been transmitted to anyone; it can only be discovered independently, through the sacred experience of theory.

Open Philosophy

As the formulator of theory, as the guide to the geography of ideas, Plato created a consciously open philosophy, in which the main point is not uttered, but must be sought and experienced independently. Hence the term "philo-soph", or "lover of Sophia", of Wisdom. If the question at hand was simply who bears this Wisdom, we would be dealing with a closed system, that is, something individual. Wisdom cannot be learned, it is not a given. One can only break through to it upon enormous labor and at the cost of incredible efforts. Philosophy is the realm where minds and hearts gather together in passionately thirsting for Wisdom, when they are fallen in love with Sophia and are excited contenders for her hand. No one has any guarantees. There is only Love. Led by Her, they embark on their journey, towards contemplation, towards theory. They settle in the vicinity of Sophia and inch ever closer to her. They seek the universal, and thereby themselves become more and more generalized, eidetic, and less

and less individual. Philosophers construct themselves in the vicinity of Wisdom. Purifying themselves in Her rays, they reveal evermore distinct contours.

In the case of Plato, this means that we are dealing with the Logos as such, for the Logos is in its nearly original form, is still undefined, and is open to being opened or closed, understood in one way or another, or conceived and outlined in one or another vector. In Plato, philosophy is the sharp impulse of nearing Sophia Perennis, the leap into the ocean of eternal light, it is contemplative and divine praxis. In this sense, philosophy is higher than religion and myth, insofar as religions and myths are but testimonies to the main actor – Saint Sophia. Therefore, Plato himself can be called a “Perennialist” and, correspondingly, a Traditionalist. It does not matter whether Plato adhered to Greek civil piety and offered sacrifices to the gods and heroes of his polis. Such was part of a much more important and significant philosophical cult: the cult of Sophia, the cult of the pure Logos.

Plato as an Event

Let us pose the final question. Did “Perennialism”, Traditionalism, universalism, and the philosophical cult of Sophia all begin with Plato’s Theory? With his doctrine of ideas? With his Timaeon cosmology?

For Guénon and Traditionalists, such a personification would be a scandal. But upon fully recognizing Plato’s direct connection to the “Primordial Tradition”, Traditionalists would undoubtedly begin to see Plato as a link in the golden chain of initiates which stretches back to the dawn of creation, to the earthly paradise, and which has become increasingly difficult to access, closed, and exclusive in our time, the Kali Yuga, the “end times”, the era of the “great parody.” Traditionalists understand “perennialism” literally and even somewhat naively. Such can by all means be seen as a symmetrical response to the just as literal and even more naive historicism which predominates in Modernity. Yet in the vicinity of eternity, “before” and “after”, “now” and “then” are not so important. Indeed, they have no meaning. What is important is what. Plato, like Zarathustra in Iran, might have been both an historical figure and a sacred personage, like al-Khidr or the Angel-Initiator. Perhaps there are multiple Platons. And this means that Plato’s spirit can be called upon (as Plotinus did in the temple of Isis); he can be appealed to. His return can be awaited, for there is no irreversibility in eternity. In eternity, everything is reversible – everything has even already been reversed. In the most rationalized form, one could accept that Plato merely transmitted knowledge that he had acquired along the chain of initiation, and in this sense was their ordinary re-translator who became world famous only by virtue of the importance of the truths he voiced, as a kind of philosophical prophet.

Yet Plato can be approached in other ways as well, for example, as an Event in the spirit of the Heideggerian Ereignis. This would distance us from both the “Perennialists” and the “historicists.” Plato happened and philosophy happened. Sophia was designated and the philosophical geography was marked. If this was supposed to have happened, then it would have happened no matter what – whether by way of Plato or someone else, should we be reproached on this matter. But perhaps it would be better to think differently: if Plato did not exist, there would be nothing else. In particular, there would be no notes in the margins of his texts. There would be no philosophy. If Plato was in fact divine, then he cannot be subordinated to any mechanical necessity. Nothing can oblige him to be. Further, if he had not risked everything to become Plato, his philosophy would have been negligible. Thus, Sophia might not have been. Or in other words: instead of Sophia, instead of the secret bride of the order of lovers, something else could have been revealed to Plato.

Plato’s exceptionality (although perhaps this is just as wrong and does not correspond to the truth) is more existentially attractive and productive than his link in the chain, even if it is the golden one. Plato’s divinity lies in that he was human.

Modern Traditionalism is, of course, more adequate than profane academic philosophy and is more prosperous than Post-Modernity. But all the signs of Traditionalism’s transformation into a convention, a routine, into a “scholasticism”, of its conscious quenching of any living movement of the soul or heart, are glaring. Here it is discovered that “Perennialism” is a construct and always was such from the very beginning. The appeal of a Traditionalist towards really existing tradition decides nothing, just as Plato’s reverence for his paternal gods did not exhaust his philosophy.

Traditionalism is something other than tradition. It is a breakthrough to that which is the tradition of traditions, the secret grain, the theory. But being a theory, a construct, it needs to be continuously recreated. A construct is not so bad if the matter at hand is something rooted in the light nature of man himself. By creating, man creates himself. Therefore, Traditionalism must either happen or disappear. Its claims are too enormous and its bar has been set too high by Guénon and the Sophiologists on whom he constructed his doctrine. “Perennialism” means that Sophia is Perennis: she is here and now. But how can we relate the fact of the Kali Yuga, our God-abandoned “now” and the dustbin of the modern Western-centric global world, our vile, desolate “here”, with the rays of the Angel-Initiator, the light of Great Love, and the nature of man as a winged divine being? The Gnostics offered a dualist answer which often seems to be the only one acceptable and applicable to us. But is this not simply a recognition of our own weakness, of our own personal inability to transform the “Cover” into the “Mirror”, Absence into Presence, apophany into epiphany, and occultation into revelation? Is this not the signature on the warrant for the death of the Logos, the insuperability of Western nihilism, or the recognition of the closed, self-referential world to be the only possible and real?

Traditionalists frequently speak of the “great parody” that is the modern world. This is true, but are they themselves not a parody? After all, not only Guénon, but the Neoplatonists, and Plato himself can all be parodied.

The discrepancies between Traditionalism and Heidegger did not hinder Henry Corbin from engaging Neoplatonism in Islam with love and delicate refinement over the course of his life. Such is the behavior of a living person who responds to Sophia’s whisper no matter where it resounds.

Today this whisper is more silent than ever. But it cannot be so quiet as to be indistinguishable at all. We must learn to listen to silence, for silence sometimes conveys extremely meaningful things.

Footnotes:

[1] Mark Sedgwick, *Against the Modern World: Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[2] Frances Yates, *The Art of Memory* (Saint Petersburg: 1997); *Ibidem.*, *The Rosicrucian Enlightenment* (Moscow: Aletheia, Enigma, 1999); *Ibidem.*, *Giordano Bruno and the Hermetic Tradition* (Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2000).

[3] René Alleau, *De Marx à Guénon: d’une critique ‘radicale’ à une critique ‘principielle’ des sociétés modernes* (Paris, Les dossiers H., 1984).

[4] Some aspects of this question have already been treated in Alexander Dugin, *Postfilosofiia* (Moscow: Eurasian Movement, 2009).

[5] Henry Corbin, *Le paradoxe du monothéisme* (Paris, 1981).

[6] André-Jean Festugière, *Contemplation et vie contemplative selon Platon* (Saint Petersburg: Nauka, 2009).

Translator: Jafe Arnold

Chapter 8 of *In Search of the Dark Logos: Philosophico-Theological Outlines*

(Moscow: Academic Project/Department of the Sociology of International Relations, Faculty of Sociology, Moscow State University, 2013).

4pt

Turan: The Key to Understanding the Russian Logos

September 7, 2018

Author: Alexander Dugin

Translator: Jafe Arnold

From Ekspertiza Dugina #17. (The following is a partial transcript of Alexander Dugin's video talk on his recent new Noomachy: Wars of the Mind volume: The Logos of Turan: The Indo-European Vertical Ideology (Moscow, 2017).

The task of describing Turanian civilization in the recent volume of Noomakhia was inseparable from the fact that Turan is gone. The book was therefore a reconstruction of a past society, an archaeological volume, in which Turanian civilization had to be restored bit by bit on the basis of archaeological research, linguistic analysis, what we know about ethnology and ethnography, and essentially artificial methods.

A few Turanian peoples can be named. For example, the Ossetians are the last heirs of the Sarmatians, there are the various Pashtun tribes, and the direct descendants of the Indo-European nomads in the Great Steppe. There are also descendants in Nuristan, the Kalash in Pakistan and Afghanistan, enclaves of direct Turanian cultures and Indo-Europeans nomadic tribes. But, of course, this is largely a conditional reconstruction.

What is the importance of Turan? The very concept of Turan is sometimes misinterpreted. We know it from Suhrawardi and Shahnameh, which speaks of a confrontation between Iran and Turan. By Iran Shahnameh meant settled Iranian civilization, whereas by Turan was understood nomadic civilization.

Ferdowsi wrote this in a period when the Turkic peoples had already for several centuries largely taken over the role of nomads. Hence the impression that Turan is related to the Turks, ([the names of] which are of the same or similar root), and as follows, the confrontation between Turan and Iran was between the Turkic and the Indo-European, particularly the Iranian world. But this is not true etymologically or historically, because Ferdowsi took the term Turan from the Avesta, from the oldest layers of pre-Islamic culture where this term existed since time immemorial, when there were still no Turks on the expanses of Eurasia and the Eurasian steppes.

When we begin to consider the term, this Indo-European term, it meant none other than “people.” It is very similar to the Lithuanian concept of Tauta (“nation” or “people”) and Deutschen and Teutonen. In fact, this [Turan] was the name of the very same ancestors of the Indo-Europeans, the very same Iranians, only the nomadic ones, who lived on the territory of the Great Eurasian Steppes. Some of them moved to Persia, closer to Elam, to Media, where they settled and came to be called Iran. Those who continued to live under the same conditions came to be called Turanians. In Iranian civilization, Turan is understood as the realm of the nomadic Iranians, whereas Iran is the area of the settled Iranians.

Thus immediately arises a completely different vision of Turan which has nothing to do with the Turks. If we look closely at where they came from and who the Iranian nomadic tribes in Eurasia were, then it turns out that they were always there – precisely in the Eurasian steppes. Regardless of whichever archaeological hypothesis we accept – that is, regardless of whether the Indo-Europeans originated closer to the Black Sea, the Azov Sea, the Caspian Sea, or in the Southern Urals – in any case we are dealing with the space of Turan, the space of the Great Eurasian Steppe.

The Turanian world was in all actuality represented by none other than the warlike nomadic tribes who domesticated the horse, built chariots, and began to use the wheel, who boasted colossal militancy, and began to spread across the whole Eurasian mainland, going all the way to the West, where their descendants became the Celts, Germans, Italic peoples, the Illyrians, Thracians, and to Greece (as the ancestors of the Hellenes), to Anatolia (one of the first Indo-European tribes, where they laid the basis for Serbian civilization). The Slavs and Balts are bearers of the Turanic element, because these are the same Indo-European peoples who moved together with the Kurgan culture, according to Gimbutas, to the West, at some point settling on different territories. There are the Iranians and Indians as well.

This Turanian world is the key, ancestral homeland and proto-matrix of all of Indo-European civilization.

By what means were they able to extend their influence to practically the whole of Eurasia? The wheel. We can see how this process of the Indo-Europeans’ expansion continued into the colonial period. Even today’s cars are part of the Turanian worldview, the new chariots. This is the line of the expansion of chariots, the expansion of martial style, the Indo-European languages, and the Indo-European political system – which is patriarchal, masculine, and androcratic.

Androcracy is the rule of men. The power of androcratic societies created the historical-political landscape of nearly all of Eurasia, with the exception of the Chinese, Southeast Asia, and perhaps some of the Semitic regions of the Middle East. Palestine was once inhabited by the Hittites, the chariots of the Hurrians, perhaps the Indo-Aryans, and the Mittani went to Egypt – hence the appearance of the chariot in Egypt.

In other words, Turan itself is a kind of paradigm. It is Indo-European nomadism, which most likely spread from the Southern Urals. I think that this is the most accurate hypothesis.

Later this initiative of the Indo-European, patriarchal, androcratic societies was taken on by other peoples, such as the Huns, Turks, and Mongols. And it was then that the space of Turan was brought a very similar nomadic culture by other – non-Indo-European and post-Indo-European – ethnoi.

If we put this all together, then we see a colossal picture of all Indo-European societies, their source model, and their differences, which are relative to degree of remoteness from the Indo-European homeland, which was the Turanian homeland. When the Indo-European peoples moved away from this homeland and mixed with more matriarchal, agricultural societies, they created a mixed type of culture. In the final analysis, Turan thus acquires an entirely different significance, another dimension. If we are not indifferent to our roots, then this Indo-European Turan, as the homeland of Indo-European cultures, is in my opinion an extremely important element for understanding ourselves, because our country is the territory of Turan.

After many centuries and millennia, after Turan had originally been the territory of the Indo-Europeans, after the Indo-European peoples had passed their initiatives to other non-Indo-European peoples, such as the Altaic and partially the Uralic, the heritage of Turan once again returned to Russia. We, the Russian Indo-European people, are the keepers of this gigantic territory of Turan. The mission of the Indo-Europeans has made a full circle, starting with Indo-Europeans and ending with Indo-Europeans, in coming to us.

Thus, Eurasianism acquires an entirely different dimension, and the notion of Turan is transformed radically. And, of course, if we are sensitive towards our own identity, and if we are not indifferent toward our roots, our past, and our future, then I think that this book would find very wide resonance in another state of society...

But we live in a world of some kind of pause. I look to the future with optimism, as the present time of dark mental illness in society will pass, and we will return to the search for ourselves, return to our Russian rebirth, to our roots. And then the idea of Turan, which allows us to look at all of our history in a completely different way, including the Mongol conquests, our relations with the Turks, the Turkic peoples, and projects such as the creation of the Eurasian Union, which has now been declared in policy or is being implemented (albeit in the form of a simulacrum) – all of this will truly acquire meaning.

Share this:

Why fascism was (is) wrong?

Primary tabs

View(active tab) What links here

Alexander Dugin

Why fascism was (is) wrong?

(critics from 4-th Political Theory point of view)

1. It was Modern and dealt with the concept belonging to the Enlightenment philosophy. It is absolutely wrong: the Modernity is evil and falsehood. It was Modern political theory. Much better than other modern political theories, but still modern. Essentially. In all its aspects that were non-Modern, anti-Modern and Post-Modern it was not wrong.

2. It was eurocentric. Any ethnic group (we-group) is ethnocentric. It is quite normal. But to be eurocentric in the Modern Europe is the same as to be anti-European, because the european Modernity is not European at all. Being eurocentric in Modern Europe and against all other (non-European) societies judged retarded and sub-human means to be anti-traditional. The appeal to the return to the european (German, indo-aryan) roots was quit legitimate and good. But opposition of the deep identity of Europe to the identities of other societies (much less modernized than Germany of XX century) was absolutely wrong and unjustifiable.

3. It was based on little nationalism. So Germans against French's, Slaves and so on. It was wrong and many German thinkers and fighters supporting Hitler were against such position (including Leon Degrelle for example). German or Italian nationalism is one thing - finally little thing. Indo-European (indo-aryan) is other, much greater. The Sacred Tradition and the Third Empire of Spirit is the third thing, the greatest one. If little nationalism agrees to be embedded in the Indo-European context is good. When it stresses the inner differences it is bad. The same for Indo-European civilization. If it recognizes its sacred nature (Tradition) is good. If it conceives itself as goal in itself it is not acceptable and looses its legitimation.

4. It attacked the first political theory and second political theory simultaneously. That was main reason of its strategic and military defeat. On the ideologically level the same was the reason of its intellectual defeat. The rule (explicitly defined in the 4PT) is the attack on the communism is valid and legitimated ONLY AFTER the common victory over the liberals. Geopolitically speaking Land wins the Sea and only AFTER that its parts decide who is Heartland. If the inner struggle starts BEFORE the victory over first political theory (capitalism and anglo-saxon thalassocratic Empire of money and lie) or even if the

communists are declared the enemy number one instead of liberals, the fascism helps the liberals to win and pushes the communists on the side of the MAIN EVIL. So the fascism was absolutely wrong here.

These four points are essential negative moments. There were other less important as the theoretical weight. There were some positive moments: anti-capitalism, anti-materialism and other anti-modern features. That is valid for real historic fascism with all its terrible and fascinating (for some) aspects.

Today "fascism" consists only from weak and wicked points. It is fully reducible to these four moments: it is modern (as concept of Nation is Modern), eurocentric, chauvinistic and first anti-communist and only after (demagogically) critical of liberalism. It gathers all weak points of historic fascism and is completely devoid of any positive ones. That's why it is but a caricature. That's why it should be overcome and transcended. That's why it only serves as secondary weapon for liberals (as well as neo-leftists, anti-globalists and eco clowns - also the puppets of the capitalist masters).

The fascism is semantically and historically exhausted. Its rests as self-parodies. Dawn with that. Let make one step ahead.

The order of destruction (deconstruction) becomes now DOGMATIC:

Against liberalism.

When the liberals are dead and for sure, let us liquidate the materialist marxists (principal critics of Modern world by Guenon instead of radical critics of capitalism by Marx). When the Global Oligarchy will lay in the ruins we will need finish with reds. But before that point we are allies. Who call to fight left first are traitors. Fight first REAL ENEMY.

When there are no more liberals and Global Oligarchy, there is no more marxists with their idiotic materialism and mechanistic determinism, with their imagined proletariat or worse "multitudes", with their unqualified egalitarianism and perverted mentally "intellectuals" and "degenerated art", we will exterminate finally neo-nazi fools. Only then but not earlier. But if any person of these three ideological camps would eventual change his (her) mind accepting our logic and our Fourth Path he (she) will be cordially welcomed.

It is almost impossible to pass from the first political theory to Fourth. It is the same as to be born again.

It is quite difficult to pass from the communism to the Fourth Path. But hate toward capitalism and discover of proper ethnic and cultural identity as well as anti-imperialist anti-hegemonic feeling and the love for justice can help much. In this case the communists above all national-communists are welcome.

It is much more easy for ex-fascists to make the next step on the basis of cold geopolitical and ideological analysis of the intellectual and political history of XX century and join Fourth Path. But if this step is not made the guilt of non-doers becomes greater than the stubborn attitude of fixed liberals or communists. They belong to the past. But if those who really dreamt of the future will loose the

historical chance they will have no mercy. They will be destroyed last but their crime will be biggest. They should be regarded as traitors of our struggle.

BERSERKER

BOOKS

